

## THE EUCHARISTIC CONGRESS AT RENNES

THE Eucharistic Congress which met at Rennes, in Brittany, in the first days of July, was the Fifth National Eucharistic Congress of France. These National Congresses have been held in many countries of both Europe and America during the last twenty years, and they may be described as a development of the great International Eucharistic Congress movement. But this movement itself had its origin in local and purely national gatherings in honour of the Most Holy Eucharist. Monsignor Gaston de Ségur, who died in June, 1881 (the very month in which the first of these International Congresses met at Lille), is often referred to as the founder of the movement. It owed much to his zeal and influence, but what was perhaps his most important contribution to its initiation is little known. In one of his popular works on devotion to the Holy Eucharist, he had enumerated the places in France where there was a tradition of Eucharistic miracles, and with his encouragement and assistance, Mademoiselle Tamisier of Tours, a pious lady whose whole life was devoted to good works, organized pilgrimages to some of these places. Thus, there was a visit to Ars and Avignon in 1874; to Avignon in 1876; and to Faverney in 1878; and she it was who first suggested that Catholics from many countries might meet together to do public homage to the Sacrament of the Altar. De Ségur welcomed the proposal, and with the brothers, Vrau and Féron-Vrau of Lille, planned the First International Congress, which met in that city three years after the Eucharistic pilgrimage to Faverney.

The Lille Congress was a comparatively small gathering of French and Belgian Catholics. It was the precedent of Mademoiselle Tamisier's pilgrimages that led to Avignon being chosen as the meeting place of the Second International Congress in 1882, and the Belgian co-operation in the Lille Congress led to that of 1883 meeting at Liège. It had been intended that the Congress should be an annual event, but only five were organized in the following ten years (Fribourg, 1885; Toulouse, 1886; Paris, 1888; Antwerp

1890; and Jerusalem, 1893). The Congress at Jerusalem was the first to which the Holy See sent a Cardinal Legate.

In the following seven years there were only four Congresses (Rheims, 1894; Paray, 1897; Brussels, 1898; and Lourdes, 1899). But from the first year of the present century, when the Congress met at Angers, until the last year of peace, the Congress met annually. It had now become an important international event, and most of these later assemblies were held outside the frontiers of France. The places of meeting were Angers, Namur, Angoulême, Rome, Tournai, Metz, London, Cologne, Montreal, Vienna, Malta and Lourdes. At Angoulême, in 1904, the French authorities forbade the public procession with which every Congress had so far ended. After this disappointment it seemed unlikely that an International Eucharistic Congress would meet in France for a long time to come. Of the fourteen Congresses before that year eight had met on French territory. France had been well represented at the Congresses held in Belgium, Switzerland and the Holy Land, and numbers of French prelates, priests and laity attended the subsequent gatherings in other countries. But amongst zealous Catholics there arose a desire that, even in the years in which an International Congress met in some other country, there should be a Eucharistic Congress in France, a public act of faith and worship in honour of the Sacramental Presence of Our Blessed Lord. Two lay Catholic leaders, the Comte Charles de Nicolai, and M. Louis Cazeaux, the President of the work of the Nocturnal Adoration, suggested the formation of a permanent organization for this object, and at their request Cardinal Richard, the Archbishop of Paris, formed the "Committee for the National Eucharistic Congresses of France" in the summer of 1902. But it was not till May, 1908, that the first of these Congresses met at Faverney, in the Haute Saône, one of the eastern departments.

Faverney, as we have noted, had been twenty years before the scene of one of Mademoiselle Tamisier's Eucharistic pilgrimages. The Congress met on May 23rd, the anniversary of the Eucharistic miracle of 1608. The local tradition, supported by contemporary evidence, tells how in its abbey church during an Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament the decorations of the altar caught fire, but the monstrance and the Sacred Host it held remained unconsumed in the midst of a furnace-like mass of flame, and were seen suspended in

mid air while all around fell in ruins. Faverney still keeps the anniversary as a feast day. The Second National Eucharistic Congress of France was held at Ars in August, 1911, the year of the International Eucharistic Congress of Vienna. The Third Congress met at Paray-le-Monial in 1921, at the same time as the local celebration of the Canonization of St. Margaret Mary. Next year came the International Eucharistic Congress at Rome, the first since the long interruption of the series by the war and the troubled times that followed it. It was understood that the International Congresses would meet on alternate years, and the Paris Committee decided that in the years when there was no international meeting a National Congress should be held in France. Accordingly the Fourth National Congress of France met in Paris in 1923, and this year the Fifth was convened at Rennes on the invitation of Cardinal Charost and the Catholics of Brittany. Before this date the example of France had already been followed in other Catholic countries, in both the Old and the New World.

But these National Eucharistic Congresses have seldom been even mentioned in the English press. Even our Catholic newspapers have as often as not made little or no reference to them. When I went to Rennes last month as the representative of the *Catholic Times* I found myself the only foreign correspondent present. Some day perhaps we shall have a National Eucharistic Congress in Great Britain or Ireland, and it may be therefore useful to give here, not a detailed account of the great gathering at Rennes, but some impressions of it, in order to show how our brethren in France organize these national celebrations.

The Congress met in Rennes on the invitation of its Archbishop, Cardinal Charost, given at the Congress in Paris two years ago. The local organizing committee was formed last summer, and the necessary expenses of the meeting were largely met by a subscription opened in the columns of the Catholic press of France. The city was well adapted for the meeting place of the Congress. It has good railway communications, and several lines meet at its junction on the main line from Paris to Brest. It is a city of some 80,000 inhabitants, the old capital of Brittany and the centre of a very Catholic district. Though in most places in France public processions of the Blessed Sacrament are forbidden by the authorities, and there is a strong Socialist element

in the City Council of Rennes, there has for many years been a procession through its streets on the Sunday on which the feast of Corpus Christi is kept. There was therefore no difficulty in arranging that the Congress should close with this solemn public act of worship. Indeed Cardinal Charost in his pastoral on the Congress thanked the Municipality for its friendly co-operation.

Further it may be noted that for Brittany and the adjacent provinces Rennes has long been a place of pilgrimage, as it has two shrines of our Blessed Lady, whose record of miracles goes back to the Middle Ages, that of "Notre Dame de Miracles et de Vertus" in the church of St. Sauveur, and that of "Notre Dame de Bonne Nouvelle" in the church of Notre Dame. Rennes has an interesting history, but most of the city has a very modern aspect. The late Mr. Baring Gould, in his book on Brittany, libelled it by describing it as one of the ugliest cities in Europe, a judgment so outrageously unjust that I imagine the novelist must have visited it in a time of bad weather, and when he was suffering from a fit of depression. He revelled in the beautiful Gothic architecture of other French cities and must have been disappointed at finding very little of it at Rennes. Its best piece of Gothic, the rebuilt church of St. Aubin, dates from recent years. Most of the old city was destroyed by a fire early in the eighteenth century. A little later its cathedral of St. Pierre was in such a ruinous condition that it had to be rebuilt, and this was done in poor semi-classical style. Several of the churches have the same story of eighteenth century reconstruction. The "great pillage" of the Revolution has left its traces in the secularization of many buildings once devoted to sacred uses. A domed Renaissance church dating from the seventeenth century is now a cinema theatre. What was once a beautiful Gothic chapel is now a hardware store. The old seminary buildings now house the University library, but outside Rennes, on the high ground above the River Ille, the new seminary has a fine range of buildings, a large Gothic chapel and gardens like a park, which command a splendid view of the city.

The general meetings were held each afternoon in the cathedral, the first of these on Wednesday, July 1st—heralded by the pealing of all the church bells of the city—was the opening event of the Congress. Like those that followed on the three other afternoons it differed completely



from the general meetings held at the International Congresses. Instead of a number of speeches from representative men, punctuated by the applause of the audience, the chief features of these "general assemblies," were first one, or sometimes two, discourses, from the pulpit—sermons or lectures—and then a Benediction service. At the opening meeting Cardinal Charost was the speaker, and he preached a sermon, often rising to real eloquence of a high order, on the ideal of Our Lord living amongst us in the Holy Eucharist as the King of His Kingdom on earth, and on the acknowledgment of that Kingship as the best hope of human society. At the subsequent meetings we heard what was practically a course of lectures by eminent prelates and popular preachers on the theology of the Holy Eucharist. At every meeting the cathedral was crowded in every part by a congregation in which the men formed a large element. From the choir to the western doors there was not a vacant spot. When the Benediction began the people were in many places so packed together that no one could kneel. Each meeting lasted for about two hours, and every word spoken from the pulpit was followed with close attention.

The sectional meetings, held on the mornings of Thursday, Friday and Saturday, were five in number each day. There must have been nearly three thousand present at the general meetings. The sections, mostly meeting in halls belonging to various local Catholic associations, mustered audiences of from two to three hundred, in the four of them at which the laity formed the chief part of the attendance. Besides these there was a section for priests only. The four others were respectively meetings of men, women, girls and young men. At all of them there were addresses and papers on the methods of promoting devotion to the Blessed Sacrament and on the practical working of Catholic associations connected with it. The men's section had a singularly efficient chairman, Mgr. Crépin, Vicar General of Paris, who secured a good discussion at every meeting, not by merely asking if anyone would like to make a few remarks, but by calling attention to some suggestion made in the paper that had just been read, and asking now one, now another, of the audience if it had been tried in their parishes and how it had worked. Naturally in the meetings of the young people the platform speakers did nearly everything, but in the two elder sections very useful work was done, and it was interest-

ing to find what a network of active Catholic organizations exists in France and how zealously numbers of laymen and women of all classes devote themselves to their development. There were inevitably some few references to the difficulties created by the existing situation in France, but there was an almost complete absence of anything that could be interpreted as an allusion to politics or even to the conflict of the last few months. The whole tone of both papers and discussions was distinctly optimistic. There was less talk of difficulties than of progress secured, and the prospect of still better results in the immediate future. Perhaps this was because the audiences at the sectional meetings so largely represented Catholic Brittany and the west of France. Until the last two days Congressists from other parts of the country were a small minority.

But the general assemblies and the sectional meetings formed, after all, the least part of the activities of the Congress. Day and night the greater part of the time at Rennes was given to worship and prayer and unceasing acts of devotion to the Holy Eucharist. The Congress had something of the character of a five days' mission or public retreat centring on this mystery of Faith. In the early mornings the churches were full at Mass after Mass, and there were crowds of communicants at the altar rails, and among these communicants there were large numbers of men. In one or more of the churches there was Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament each day, and this was continued through the night, when there was always Midnight Mass with many Communion, and after this, usually at the beginning of each hour, a five minutes' sermon and a hymn. Thursday—the second day of the Congress—was the "children's day," admirably organized, and with a very full programme—so full that one wondered at seeing how few of the little people looked at all tired at the end of it.

The children were mostly those of the Catholic schools in and around Rennes, but parties of boys and girls arrived from long distances by train and motor-car. There were General Communion of children at all the parish churches early in the day. Between nine and ten o'clock the streets were full of parties of them marching to a second Mass and sermon in the same churches. After *déjeuner* there was a general movement to the gardens of the priory of St. Cyr outside the city, now a convent, where ten thousand of the

little folk (4,000 boys and 6,000 girls) formed up for a procession of the Blessed Sacrament. Starting from the convent it passed across a country lane to the park of the seminary, and moved under improvised arches and long arcades of decorated avenues to the open space before an altar erected on the terrace of the seminary buildings, where the rite ended with Benediction.

There were evening services at most of the churches each day. At one of them, St. Aubin, there were hymns in the old language of Brittany by village choral societies. At these services there were always large congregations. One evening at the church of St. Sauveur (the parish in which the cathedral is situated) the building was so packed that I had to give up any idea of entering it. From the open door I could see only a mass of people standing close together, so that there was not room even for one more. I may add that at all hours of the day, if I entered a church where there was neither service nor Exposition, I invariably found a number of men and women making visits to the Blessed Sacrament.

On the Saturday the Congress was reinforced by a continual stream of new arrivals by rail and road. I heard of contingents from considerable distances—one party arriving from as far off as Dijon. Sunday began with a general Communion in all the churches. In the morning there was Pontifical High Mass at the seminary, with three Cardinals and thirty Bishops in its open-air sanctuary, and some 30,000 people forming the congregation. Since the forenoon of the day before parties of workmen had been busy decorating the line of streets and boulevards to be followed by the procession of the afternoon. Early on Sunday the work was completed, and in the brilliant summer's sunshine all the central thoroughfares of the city were aglow with colour. Along a route of nearly three miles bands of draperies, here red and golden-yellow, there white and blue, hung from balcony and cornice along the house fronts and from tree to tree along the wide boulevard of the Avenue de la Liberté. There were arcades of garlands overhead, rows of flower-decked masts, and flagstaves with flags and banners. In many places even off the line of route, windows and house fronts were gaily decorated. There were two altars of repose, one on an open square at the eastern end of the route, another near the cathedral, on a splendid site—a wide open space

bounded on two sides by the rivers, the Vilaine and the Ille, which have their confluence at this point. A permanent Calvary erected here after a mission many years ago gives the square its name—the "Place de la Mission." Beside the Calvary the altar had been erected on a lofty platform approached by a wide range of steps.

We did not hear till afterwards that the local Committee received timely warning of a plot by a number of "anti-clericals" to destroy the altar of the "Place de la Mission." For two nights it was guarded by a band of Catholic young men, and all the conspirators were able to do was to post up some blasphemous placards on adjacent buildings in the night before the procession. These were discovered before day-break and promptly removed. Probably the whole attempt was the work of strangers to the city. The solemn procession was marred by no unseemly incident. In the crowds that lined the route, there was devout reverence of the great mass of the onlookers, and if there were unbelievers present their attitude was one of silent respect. It was the people themselves that kept order along the line of route. Except for an officer and half a dozen men near each of the open-air altars there was not a policeman to be seen anywhere. I told one of these officers that I was struck by the admirable order of the crowds though there was no official of any kind to regulate them. His reply was, "That is so, sir, and it is because they are Catholics." At Rennes that day one might well forget for awhile that all France was not a Catholic land. It was a triumph for the Catholics of France, and above all for those of the Catholic West.

I shall not attempt to describe the procession. It was a notable and a hopeful sign of how things are moving in France that it was very largely composed of young men. It was a novel sight to see hundreds on hundreds of the youths of the "Jeunesse Catholique" marching often eight deep (in doubled fours) with the alert bearing of trained athletes, and wearing the white drill dress and broad blue girdle of their gymnastic societies. Another characteristic feature of the procession was the long array of deputations of men and women from every diocese and parish in Brittany, some of them wearing the quaint traditional costume of their districts. The laity formed the main strength of the procession, which took nearly an hour to pass a given point. A considerable part of the long column was formed of men

marching eight deep. Where the "open order" of the Lourdes processions (now made familiar to Londoners by those of the Guild of Ransom) was adopted, the processionists were three deep on each side of the street with banner bearers in the open space between. There was a strong contingent of the religious orders of men and women; many bands of music and choirs; and parties of altar boys in surplices and red and blue cassocks. Before the canopy came the procession of prelates, thirty bishops and two mitred abbots, each walking between two of his chapter, and followed by a surpliced seminarian carrying his crosier. There were bishops of Sees in all parts of France, and besides there were bearded missionary bishops from Africa and the Near East, witnesses to the splendid part that France takes in the propagation of the Faith. Under the canopy, which was first carried in processions of the eighteenth century, the Blessed Sacrament was borne by Cardinal Maurin, Archbishop of Lyons and "Primate of All the Gauls," an historic title that tells how he is the successor of a line of prelates stretching back to the days when what is now France was a group of Provinces in the Roman Empire, before the Peace of Constantine. Next came the Cardinals of Rennes and Paris, and a crowd of senators, deputies, judges and members of the bar, professors of the University and other distinguished laymen.

The supremely impressive episode of the procession was the Benediction at the altar by the Mission Cross immediately before its return to the cathedral. The altar towered high above the crowd, its steps, where Cardinals, prelates, priests and acolytes were grouped together, forming a mass of gold and colour. Around it the processionists gathered, in the midst of an immense crowd on both sides of the two rivers. Tens of thousands of voices joined in the chanting of the Nicene Creed and the singing of the Benediction hymns. After the Benediction it was not possible to reform the procession, but the Blessed Sacrament was carried back to the cathedral close by, with the prelates around the canopy and a slowly moving mass of the people filling the street and joining in the singing of the Magnificat, with a burst of Hosannas after each of its verses.

It was a splendid culmination of these days of worship and prayer. Well might Cardinal Charost say in his closing words from the cathedral pulpit that what we had seen that day was

a living proof that the Catholic Church was a power in France, and that those who spoke of French Catholicity as inert and dying were closing their eyes to vital realities.

A little more than a hundred years ago such pessimistic views as those against which he thus protested might have been accepted by many. Rennes itself, which witnessed this triumphant public worship of the Holy Eucharist, was in the days of the Revolution the scene of what might well seem the final triumph of unbelief. Religion was banned, and in the church of St. Sauveur a "goddess of reason" was enthroned on the desecrated altar. On the scaffold before the Hotel de Ville martyrs died for their faith in the great Mystery that the city has thus honoured in our brighter day, and their blood was not shed in vain.

In his address on the opening day of the Congress the Cardinal had said he hoped and believed no one who took part in it would fail to gain a deeper devotion to the Most Holy Sacrament of the Altar. I think I have said enough to show how a National Eucharistic Congress does something of the work of a great mission. It may be many years before we have again on English ground an International Eucharistic Congress like that of Westminster in 1908. That Congress had an invaluable result in the deepening of our Catholic life and also attracted many converts to the Church. We have already our triennial National Congresses dealing with religious and social questions. Might it not be well to add to them from time to time a National Eucharistic Congress?

A. HILLIARD ATTERIDGE.



## MY HISTORY OF ENGLAND : VOL. I. A REPLY

**I**N the courteous and friendly, but adverse criticisms which Father Thurston has written in your pages upon my History of England, he has brought charges against it which fall, I think, under these heads:

First. It is intemperate. That is, it exaggerates a certain historical view; to wit, that England has, like every province of our Roman civilization, continuity with her remote past.

Second. It is in conflict with the views of many famous scholars from the other side of the controversy.

Third. It is, in a number of specific points, unhistorical: saying things which the long research of impartial men has proved untrue.

May I crave some small part of your space to reply as briefly as I can to this criticism?

It is clear that the third heading is the most important, and the only one to which direct answer can be made; but I owe it to my book to reply briefly to the first two.

*That the book is intemperate.* One of the two main theses of the origin of England is true: either England is, in the main, a place inhabited from before recorded time by much the same stock, subjected to full civilization at the hands of the Roman Empire, and thereafter modified (like other provinces) through a change of the old society during the third, fourth and fifth centuries; or England was the one and only province of the Roman Empire in which there really was (what certainly never happened elsewhere) a conquest by Germans—and pagan Germans at that—who here established their race by largely exterminating the native race; and with that race, their names.

Such conflicting historical theses are not like abstract truths. They deal with the innumerable concrete complexities of human life and are subject to a manifold modification. But, in the main, one or the other thesis colours all our conception of Englishmen and their works. I have maintained the first thesis. Have I—within my limits—exaggerated it?

I think not. I admit severe material destruction during

the pirate raids; the obliteration of bishoprics in the East; Britain reduced (between the middle of the fifth century and the seventh) to a chaos of little shifting districts under local kinglets. I make out a much worse case than does the average official Teutonist historian, who magnifies these petty rulers. But I point out that the disaster, grave as it was, could not have destroyed the people and did not as a fact destroy the towns which are found again (all but two or three) standing after the disaster as they stood before.

I make out a much worse handling of Britain by the barbarians than ever Gaul had and with much more lasting results, but to emphasize the truth that, in spite of this, the Roman foundation of Britain remained and is the main factor, I put that truth strongly and emphatically as it must be put to readers unfamiliar with it: but not warped by misproportion.

It is not intemperate to put a point of view strongly and definitely. It is intemperate to put it out of proportion. If I say the recent war was "horrible," "abominable," I am not intemperate; I am accurate. But if I say, "upon the whole we may conclude, after a general review of the evidence, that the European war of 1914-18 was somewhat irksome" my statement is grossly intemperate.

*My statements are in conflict with the views of many famous scholars upon the other side of the controversy.*

Of course they are! You can always draw up a list of famous scholars upon the official side of any controversy. But when such a list is presented as an *argument* the opponent replies: (i) No matter how laborious the work of a scholar or how famous, its value depends, as does that of the humblest man, on evidence and reason; (ii) The scholars within any particular school conform to its fashion and hold a brief for their school—otherwise they would not be members of it. You must determine the general soundness of a school before you can weigh the value of its advocates; (iii) Even that scholarship which exhibits all the knowledge required and reasons justly, has authority only in its own field of scholarship; not outside that field.

Harnack has authority when he discusses the Greek of a text, but not when he says that it has not the spirit of an eyewitness. On *that* point any man can judge as well as he.

With so much said on the two general points, let me turn to the much more important one of specific statement; for

under this third head definite answers can be given and at the same time they illustrate the weakness of the Teutonic school and its official advocates.

I make these specific accusations of unhistorical statement to be fourteen in number.

1. I am wrong in saying that revenues from land were collected over great distances in the transition of the dark ages.

2. In saying that the Saxon Shore meant a strip garrisoned by Saxons.

3. In saying that the semi-civilized west (Gaul and Britain) previous to the Roman conquest, had urban life.

4. In saying that the numbers of the North Sea pirates must have been small compared with the large numbers of Roman citizens in Britain (which I estimate at, say, five or six millions).

5. In failing to appreciate Bede's allusion to the desert condition of Old Anglia.

6. In saying that the slaves of the period of the pirates' raids were a large majority of the population.

7. In saying that the term "gewissae" was a British and not a Teutonic term.

8. In missing the great importance of Cædmon's language, which proves the spread of the so-called Teutonic dialects over Britain.

9. In saying that the early laws of East England were presumably first set down in Latin.

10. In not seeing that place names all over England prove the universal spread of a German race from overseas.

11. In not admitting that the Anglo-Saxon conquest of Britain was something quite different from the Frankish conquest of Gaul.

12. In accepting Wiener on the "Codex Argenteus" of Upsala.

13. In using the word "jargon" of the dialects spoken by the pirates and in their settlements.

14. In saying that the Roman villa remained the unit throughout the Dark Ages.

1. That the property of the greatest holders of land—the great monasteries, the bishoprics, the royal families, etc., was widely scattered, and their revenues conveyed over great distances, is surely a commonplace of history. I have only to quote the Merovingian *villæ* scattered over all Northern

and Eastern Gaul, the still wider distribution of the house of Arnulf, the Papal estates in Sicily, the endowment of any great monastery—for instance, St. Denis, near Paris, drawing dues from Sussex.

2. In the matter of the Saxon shore, the view that it means "shore garrisoned by Saxons" is merely common sense. It might conceivably mean, of course, "A shore garrisoned *against* Saxons." But why should the ordinary meaning of such a phrase be rejected for so unlikely a meaning? We know that Saxons were taken into the army like other barbarians. We know that their neighbours the Franks were used in exactly this way against their fellow Franks who threatened to raid into the civilized part this side of the Rhine. Further, we have, on the continental Saxon shore, a little group of "heims" and "hem's" exactly corresponding to such a settlement. Everything points towards the ordinary sense of the words, and nothing towards the strained sense which the Teutonist school has put upon it. If Haverfield or Hodgkin can quote real evidence upon their side it would be another matter, but they do not attempt to do so; and that for the simple reason that there is none. I am referred to Stevenson in the "English Historical Review," 1899. All he says is that he doesn't like the idea and that it is rejected by his school. But that isn't argument. What *argument*, what statement of fact, or inference, is there to put against the plain Latin, "*Litus Saxonicum*" meaning "*Shore with Saxons on it*"

3. The authority of Haverfield is again quoted against there being regular towns in Gaul and Britain previous to the Roman conquests. But Haverfield gives no evidence. It is merely the refusal of a scholar with strong anti-Roman prejudices to accept contemporary evidence.

I prefer documents and the witness of the people of the time. If there were no towns in Gaul and Britain (surely a monstrous supposition!) why does Cæsar specifically speak of them over and over again? Why does he speak of Bourges in particular as a very wealthy and important town? Why does he talk of Chartres as a religious centre? Why convene a meeting at Paris? If there were no towns before the Roman occupation in Britain, what were those mints in which the British gold coinage was struck? And how comes it that in the very days of the occupation you find Colchester in full swing and turned into a Roman colony? Or how is

Chester made a base during the progress of the conquest? Or how comes it that London is already a town of great importance, filled, as a contemporary says, with a "vast" concourse of merchants and shipping? I should rather give the denial of urban life in pre-Roman Gaul and Britain as an extreme example of the length to which an academic school can go in the face of every fact and every probability.

4. The small numbers of pirates and the large numbers of Roman citizens in fifth century Britain.

The number of pirates cannot possibly have been large, because the average ship used only held anything from thirty to fifty fighting men. Even much later, when the barbarians had learned far more about ship building, the very largest ship only held eighty fighting men. A fleet of many hundreds of ships did not give more than the strength of what to-day we call a division; and as for bringing over a population to be counted by hundreds of thousands, with their provisionment, their young children, their women, their slaves—the thing is manifestly absurd. There was some immigration in one particular case, that of the Angles; it was on a fairly large scale—some few thousands—occupying the North Eastern strip of coast. But that it was anything like a movement of millions—or quarter millions—is physically impossible. To this general argument—which is sufficient—I have added the analogy of the Danish invasions, when there was never a question of more than a few thousands. I further cite the legends in Bede and the mythological early "chronicles" which—for what they are worth—invariably speak of quite small numbers of boats; and to this we may add the lack of all intercourse between the two sides of the sea when the first raids were over. They were dashes for loot, soon exhausted.

As to the fact of Roman Britain containing some millions of citizens (I should say from five to six millions—certainly not less than four), there is (in the absence of positive statistic) in the first place the common sense of the thing. It is common sense that a high civilization with a large area of arable soil at its command, should be fairly filled up. The burden of proof lies with those who would show that it was half deserted. We have the number of towns; the great network of roads; the (presumable) old scheme of twenty-six Bishoprics; the actual seventeen Bishoprics of St. Theodore; the scheme proposed by Rome to St.

Augustine: the "Tribal Hidage"; the statistics of St. Wilfrid's Grant; the analogy of Gaul; the large local levies. All point in the same direction and suggests a continuous population for this island, subject to certain fluctuations, but normally more than four and less than six millions, when it was mainly agricultural. I am familiar with the argument from Domesday and have dealt with it at length in my forthcoming second volume. It must suffice here to say that Domesday is no more a census than Bradshaw is a gazetteer. What Domesday *does* give us, unmistakably and fully, is the land under the plough: and that is not far short of the average of the late seventeenth century.

5. I noted Bede's allusion to the Desertion of "Old Anglia": that Bede alludes to the fact that in his own time a small district (with a Roman name,—"*Angulus*,"—the "*Angle*" of the Danish Chersonese) was *said* to be depopulated and that the Angles (of whom he was one) had come from this little corner to Britain.

I do not, of course, believe that the "*Angulus*" was left entirely deserted, and Bede only speaks of its depopulation (whatever the degree of that depopulation was) as rumoured; however, the popular story has some value as evidence of a considerable displacement. But from how large a district was that displacement and how many came over from a district certainly not one hundredth of Britain in area and wretchedly poor in soil? They held but a narrow strip of English coast. Up to within a generation of Bede's own life, Welsh kinglets had won a victory upon the shores of the North Sea. Again, within twenty years of his birth, they came right up to the North Sea for a second time. It was thought a mighty feat when the Anglian kinglet managed much later to capture the little Welsh district of Leeds. The Anglian centres were on or near the coast, notably Bamborough. Everything points to a comparatively small force (but still one more tribal and homogeneous than in other cases) having settled this strip of shore—and that I have said in my history. Only, I must deny that it had the least chance of getting far west and establishing dominion but for the ordering power of the Church.

6. The number of the slaves. If the slaves were not a majority of the population, how is it that all antiquity talks of them in these terms? How is it that the great Gaulish estates are tilled by slaves? Whence come the later serfs



or villeins? We have one definite piece of British statistic; the grant to St. Wilfrid. There you have 250 *adult* slaves distributed over an area of 87 farms of 120 acres arable each—let alone their families. Mr. Chadwick is quoted against me as an authority. He has done everything possible to strain that evidence against its natural interpretation, but I find nothing convincing in what he writes: it is mere affirmation and a pious hope that the slaves were here exceptionally numerous. He brings forward no other argument. The text is plain; and if one goes upon its evidence, without forcing it to fit a theory as Mr. Chadwick does, it is clear that the slaves were a very large majority of the population: 250 adult men and women, say 700 souls, on 87 not large farms: and after all, that is what one would expect of farms under slave labour. Would not 87 such farms have on them to-day at least 700 men, women and children of the wage earning class?

7. *Gewissae*. I, of course, long ago, read Stevenson's insufficient note on this word in my *Asser* (which I have in his edition). Here, again, it is a case of a perfectly clear contemporary text as against Teutonic special pleadings, attempting to give the text something other than its natural meaning. *Asser* (who makes a point of giving the British names of men and places, side by side with the Teutonic names) tells us clearly that the people later called West Saxons were originally called by the Welsh "*Gewissae*." *Gewissae* was the older British name for the people of a district which later, as the Teutonic dialects spread, came to be called "West Saxon." All Stevenson can bring against this strong contemporary statement that *Gewissae* was a British term is a late spelling of the word, in which the "G" is softened into "I." He assumes from this that the original "G" was an Aspirated Teutonic "G," not a hard Welsh "G." Then why did *Asser* say that the Britons used the hard "G"? It is as though fifteen hundred years hence a man were to say that Montreal was not seventeenth century French in origin because, in 1900, it had come to be pronounced in America "*Mongreawe*."

8. *Cædmon* used Teutonic Speech. Of course! But where did *Cædmon* come from? From that very narrow east coast strip of which I have spoken. If *Cædmon* had come from Lancashire or from the Midlands there would be something in the argument. But coming from where he did, there is nothing in it. Everyone admits that this strip of coast

had Teutonic speech by Cædmon's time. My whole thesis is that the Teutonic speaking belt was narrow and would never later have spread its language over the island but for the influence of the Catholic Church in communion with Rome.

9. Liebermann and the original language of the early laws. Here again we have the citation of a Teutonist who (of course) makes every effort to prove an unnatural case. But what does his assertion weigh? We have no *direct* proof whether these early laws were first written down in Latin and then translated into local dialects or first written down in the local dialects and then translated into Latin. What we have got is abundant analogy, and behind it the elementary social fact that the people who did the writing were the only people who could write: the Latin speaking and Latin using clergy. Latin was overwhelmingly the commonest official language until a much later date. The formulæ, in every other document we can test, are clearly Latin formulæ translated into dialect: in vastly the greater part they are Latin formulæ which people did not even take the trouble to translate. In the case of all other barbaric laws we know that Latin was the common form. If we find Latin as the original of all parallel documents; if we know that the people who drew up the documents were Latin using and Latin speaking; if we remember that Latin was the civilized language, and the united language, the medium of all Western Europe at the time, what conclusion can we come to, in reason, but that which I have maintained? To wit, that the laws of a tiny district like Kent were drawn up in Latin by Latin using clerics and then put into the local *patois* for the benefit of those to whom they would apply.

10. Place names. That is the one solid fact, and the only solid fact, on the Teutonist side of the discussion. But when one considers Europe and history as a whole it is manifest that place names follow a fashion of existing language, while often betraying a stratum of older language. In other words, place names are not a function of race but of tongue, as it spreads and changes. If anyone doubt this, let him consider the following list: Lewes, Hamsey, Coombe, Kingston, Iford, Swanborough, Houndean, Southover, Glynde, Glyndebourne, Mount Caburn, Ranscombe, Cliff Hill.

I have here taken a list of place names (names of villages, farms, woods, etc.) from a small district which a Teutonist must regard as being wholly settled, if no other were, by

the barbarians; a maritime colony of Sussex—the Ouse valley below Lewes. Look at these names.

You may say on reading them, "Five of these names are clearly aboriginal, another six have become Teutonic, and two, or perhaps three, are a mixture of the two." A Teutonist might add, "There you have a good example of an invading race settling down and mixing its place names with those of the conquered."

Very well. But take another maritime district, which no one has ever maintained to be settled during the Anglo-Saxon raids; I mean the distant western district of the Lower Dart valley, round Dartmouth. Look at this list. Stoke Fleming, Pound House, Warfleet, Woodbury Farm, Old Mill Creek, Fire Beacon Hill, Dittisham, Coombe, Kingston, Laphorne, Bugford, Norton, Ash, Milton, Wheatland, Red Lap, Downton, Blackpool.

It is exactly the same as the first, except that the proportion of Teutonic names is rather larger. In some cases you have identically the same words, *e.g.*, Kingston. The Teutonist faced by this list of place names, wholly English, but yet belonging to a district which was certainly aboriginal and unconquered upon any theory, may take refuge by saying that it is near the sea and *may* have received some unrecorded pirate settlement.

Well, then, what about this list, from the immediate neighbourhood of Tavistock, well within the old Cornish boundary: a place over which there was not even nominal West Saxon Government until the eighth century. Whitchurch, West Down, Wringworthy, Newton, Abbotsfield, Three Oaks, Kilworthy, Heathfield, Hardwick, Bushford, Hazelden, Passwell: are they not English?

You find such names all over the map of England: East and West indifferently. It is because the *language* gradually became of one kind. You find this not only in England but everywhere, throughout the world, wherever a language has spread. Within a short walk of one centre in a rural district of Champagne, which I know well, you have the following list, in which every name is *Italian* in origin. Why? Because the Latin language spread throughout Gaul. Petit Loges, Grand Loges, St. Hilaire, Beaumont, Villers, Sept Saulx, Mont de la Croix, La Veuve, Fontane, Epine. Does anyone pretend on the basis of French place names that the Gauls were exterminated and that Italians took their place?

11. Chadwick says that the Anglo-Saxon conquest of Britain was different from the Frankish conquest of Gaul.

It was: for there was something like conquest in certain narrow strips of Eastern Britain, but there was nothing of conquest in Gaul. Clovis and his father before him were Roman Generals, and the little army of Clovis comprised, after his tussle with another General, Syagrius, not only his own few, original, troops from Tournai but those of Syagrius as well. Clovis had the whole population of Gaul on his side; his monarchy was popular; and it was with great French levies, not with a handful of his own Flemings, that he ousted the heretic rule from the South.

12. Wiener's argument fixing a late date for the Codex of Upsala.

This is a point of really first rate importance and worthy of an article to itself.

I am told that I ought not to have admitted this argument, because the learned Bradley had destroyed it, and a reference was given to Bradley's article in the "English Historical Review." I should add that Mr. Ramsay Muir in a violently adverse criticism of my book in the *Westminster Gazette*, has used exactly the same argument (if argument it can be called). He told me that Bradley had rejected Wiener's thesis on the Codex and that therefore the matter was settled. I confess that I am bewildered by such statements. Bradley did not refute Wiener; he made no attempt to meet Wiener. He wrote about one foolscap page of abuse in which there is not so much as a mention of the Codex of Upsala and left it at that.

I would beg all my readers to consider very carefully this sort of "authority" on a point of capital importance to European history, the date of the Codex Argenteus. This Codex is the great authority for an imaginary early German tongue. On it all the main references to early German, to a pure German tongue not yet subject to Roman influence, are based. Wiener has advanced certain definite and powerful points which should convince any impartial reader that the Codex cannot be earlier than 716, and is more probably somewhat later and of Carolingian date. Wiener's points are as follows:

(i) The ascription of an early date to the Codex has been due to a superficial resemblance between it and the Brixianus, but a close examination of the writing shows that it is in quite a different penning from that of the Brixianus, while it *does* closely resemble the texts of Theodolphus of the ninth century. The letters are what is technically called "full"; in the Brixianus they are not. In the Theodolphian MSS. they are.

(ii) The Codex of Upsala is ornamented with two characteristic marks throughout, (a) the lines enclosing the canonical numbering, (b) the four round arches. Both these characteristic ornamentations are Carolingian in the West (the earliest specimen, however, 716); though earlier specimens of *one* of them have been found in Syriac MSS.

No one can read arguments of that kind without feeling the conviction they carry with them. If we are disputing whether a painting on wood be of the seventeenth century or modern work, a superficial examination of the wood, finding it to be oak, would tell one nothing of the date. But a more careful examination, showing it to be what is called "three-ply" (*i.e.*, an oak veneer combined with other wood in a fashion unknown before the nineteenth century), would be conclusive. The picture could not possibly be seventeenth century, and must necessarily be a modern one. Now that is what Wiener has done with the Codex Argenteus. How does Bradley meet this? Very simply: by not saying a word about it. There is not in Bradley's brief abuse one line or one word which even discusses the crushing argument of Wiener against the traditional ante-dating of the Codex of Upsala. Yet this discovery is of the very first moment to European history; for upon the Codex of Upsala reposes the whole fabric of an imaginary early German grammar and vocabulary, prior to the effect upon the German dialects of the high civilization which so greatly affected their vocabulary later on.

I repeat; Wiener not only in my judgment, but in the judgment of anyone who will follow without prejudice his detailed argument, has destroyed the false date of the Codex of Upsala, and with it destroyed the huge unreal structure based upon it. Why not meet him? Why refer those who agree with him (as I do) to mere abuse of him, or to other writtings of his which have nothing to do with the matter?

13. I am blamed for using the word "jargon" of the German dialects in the fifth and sixth centuries. It seems to me exactly the word to use. A jargon may be defined as "some current form of speech not fixed by a literature and of heterogeneous origin,—floating, changeable"; and that is exactly what the dialects of the barbarians on the limits of the Empire were, as you can see by any number of evidences, of names, and of vocabulary, of differences in pronunciation, and the rest of it.

14. I am told that I have disregarded Maitland's "argument" against the continuity of the villæ in England; I am

given the well worn reference to "Domesday Book and beyond." But the reference has no weight; it deals only—(and in two lines!)—with the argument from place names, which I have already dealt with. The phrase used by Maitland is that it is "*incredible that the bulk of the population should have been of Celtic blood and yet the Celtic names should disappear.*" It was incredible to Maitland, defending, of course the official academic position; it is not incredible to the ordinary reader using his common sense. There is nothing incredible to me in believing that the French are not Italians, although most of their place names are Italian; in believing that the negroes of Georgia are not white men, although they use the language of white men; in believing that the Irish are not English, although they use the language of the English. Place names commonly—not always, but commonly—are modified with the modification of language.

That the dialects of the East Coast belt spread westward cannot be accounted for by mere miraculous extermination at any time, and not even the most extravagant would dream of talking of such conquest or extermination, after the eighth century. Yet the Eastern languages spread, and we have to look about for some force to account for that Western diffusion of the Eastern tongues. I answer—what surely should be apparent to everyone with a general knowledge of early Europe—that there was only one force capable of doing this: a force corresponding in the sixth, seventh and eighth centuries to the force of industrial capitalism and banking finance to-day. That force was the Catholic Church.

After the voluntary isolation of the Western bishoprics, their refusal to act with the Pope, the Catholic Church clearly plumped for the Eastern Courts, the Eastern laws and the Eastern languages; and it was under the influence of the Catholic Church that the rule of those courts and the use of their language gradually spread.

It was mainly because Winchester was orthodox while Dumnonia was in schism that the Court of Winchester took over the pivot point of Glastonbury, advanced to the Exe, and gradually to the very limits of Cornwall. It was because Winchester was orthodox and North Wales schismatic that the language of the East Coast strip and its rule advanced at last over Lancashire to the Western sea.

If anyone can suggest another force comparable to that of the Church in England between 650 and 800, its claims may be considered. But I know of none.

HILAIRE BELLOC.



## ST. PETER IN ROME

### SOME NEW LIGHTS ON AN OLD CONTROVERSY<sup>1</sup>

THE doubt which has been cast upon the historical fact of St. Peter's presence in Rome has always been a favourite weapon in the armoury of anti-papal controversialists. Under stress of the discussions which the question has engendered, much has been done to clear up the position and to present the rather fragmentary and indirect evidence in a form which does justice to its really compelling force. More than once it has happened of recent years that a powerful vindication of the Catholic claim, at least in its more general features, has come from scholars who owe no sort of allegiance to the Roman Church. Foremost among these efforts, obviously inspired by no motive but the love of historical truth, must of course be reckoned the discussion of the subject by the late Bishop Lightfoot of Durham in the second edition of his *Apostolic Fathers*.<sup>2</sup> Hardly less important, on account of its insistence upon the archæological aspects of the question, is the detailed argument which occupies so large a place in the Bampton Lectures for 1913 delivered by Dr. George Edmundson under the general title of "The Church in Rome in the First Century." Still more recently we have the essay of Professor Lietzmann of Jena, "Petrus und Paulus in Rom; liturgische und archäologische Studien" (Bonn, 1915), in which he defends with much learning the general trustworthiness of the Roman claim. As an American critic of this volume, in the "Harvard Theological Review," has quite correctly stated: "Coming from a well-known Protestant scholar this new and very valuable contribution to the *vexata quæstio* was warmly welcomed by eminent Catholic writers."<sup>3</sup> It is in any case noteworthy that Professor Lietzmann, undeterred by sundry protests raised by his co-religionists, has since then reaffirmed his conclusions in an article printed in English in the same learned Harvard periodical from which the above sentence

<sup>1</sup> "Saint-Sébastien hors les Murs—la basilique, le souvenir apostolique, le cimetière ad catacumbas," par H. Chéramy, avec une Préface de Mgr. Batiffol; Maison de la Bonne Presse, 5 rue Bayard, Paris, 1925.

<sup>2</sup> See especially "St. Clement of Rome," Vol. II., pp. 490—502.

<sup>3</sup> George La Piana in the "Harvard Theological Review," January, 1921, p. 53.

is quoted.<sup>1</sup> There can be little question that as the result in large measure of such impartial investigations as these, recent opinion even in the strongholds of Protestant orthodoxy has come round to accept the tradition that St. Peter exercised his episcopal office in Rome and that he died there in the reign of Nero, a martyr to the faith which he had preached.

All the more surprising then is the pronouncement which has been given to the world with a most imposing air of self-confidence and finality by Mr. E. T. Merrill, Professor of Latin in the University of Chicago, in his book, "Essays in Early Christian History," published last year. Upon a number of reviewers, obviously unfamiliar with the age-long controversy involved, Professor Merrill seems to have produced the impression of an explorer whose remarkable discovery had shaken the Church of Rome to its foundations. They pointed out to their admiring readers that no clear contemporary statement could be adduced in proof of St. Peter's presence in Rome, that the Acts of the Apostles suggest nothing of the kind, that the only thing we know concerning his later life is that his own first epistle was written from "Babylon," that the so-called Roman tradition was inextricably mixed up with fabulous legends about Simon Magus which no serious scholar would now dream of defending, and that the twenty-five years Roman episcopate attributed to St. Peter with a quite suspicious unanimity by later historians such as Eusebius, could not be reconciled with the other data they supplied and with the complete silence of St. Paul concerning his fellow apostle in the epistle to the Romans. The fact that these difficulties had been duly considered and answered not only by countless Catholic apologists, but by eminent Anglicans such as Lightfoot and C. H. Turner, and by Lutherans of the standing of Harnack and Zahn was completely ignored. Professor Merrill's "epoch-making work" was presented as having broken entirely new ground and was recommended as a model of sane and up-to-date criticism to those who would fain oppose the Romanizing tendencies now unfortunately so prevalent.<sup>2</sup> Perhaps before I call attention to some of the points most insisted upon by Professor Merrill and to the recent archæological

<sup>1</sup> "The Tomb of the Apostles ad Catacumbas," "Harvard Theol. Rev.," April, 1923, pp. 147-162.

<sup>2</sup> The book seems to have been largely sent round to the daily press and was reviewed there for the most part as a novelty. It should be pointed out, however, that the notice in *The Times Literary Supplement* by no means adopted the same tone.

evidence which he has systematically ignored, it may not be out of place to give some idea of the critic's tone by one or two textual citations. The following passage, for example, is highly characteristic of the author's style and attitude of mind.

The late (and perfectly ingenuous) origin of the belief that connected St. Peter with Rome has been pointed out, along with the gradual accretion thereto of additional details, more of them the longer the time that had elapsed since the alleged events concerned. The story bears every mark of a myth. It is entirely lacking in support by historical evidence. The only reason why it has not been universally rejected by all competent scholars except those who are bound on their allegiance to accept and support it, is merely that it has come to be a doctrine so tremendously imposing by the age-long repetition of millions of voices and by the grandeur of the structure that has been erected upon it. On it the Church of Rome regards herself as founded. Yet the historical base is not rock, but incoherent sand.<sup>1</sup>

I must confess that I do not quite see why the doctrine of St. Peter's presence in Rome should appear so "tremendously imposing" as to persuade theological opponents to accept it again after the reformers had scoffed at it for three centuries and more.<sup>2</sup> The more impressive the claim, the more imperative the need for those arrayed in a hostile camp to refute and denounce it. It is because the refutation has failed that the more scholarly and less fanatical inquirers outside the Church are ready to bear witness to the truth. If there is one doctrine of the Catholic Faith which could appropriately be styled "tremendously imposing by the age-long repetition of millions of voices," it would be the Petrine claim to indefectibility coupled with the power of the keys—"upon this rock I will build my Church," etc. And this at least has in its favour a plain text which every Christian can read in his Bible. Nevertheless this is precisely the one doctrine which all dissentient bodies unite in rejecting. As for the historical fact of the presence of St. Peter in Rome and his Roman episcopate it is questionable whether it can,

<sup>1</sup> Merrill, "Essays in Early Christian History," p. 332.

<sup>2</sup> To take a single example among many, Jewel writes: "Here we see how foully they are deceived which say Peter was bishop of Rome and did sit there five and twenty years. They that say so know not what they say. It is an error." Jewel's Works (Parker Society), II., 908.

strictly speaking, be called a *doctrine* at all. But there are other remarks of the Chicago professor which are even more interesting as a revelation of his point of view.

The best students on the Roman side [says Mr. Merrill again] lay their greatest stress upon the two facts that there was no challenge in antiquity of the truth of the purely historical statement concerning the Roman preaching, bishopric and death of St. Peter, and that there has been an unbroken belief in it by their whole Church from the earliest ages to the present day. The former of these contentions is true enough, but under the known conditions of antiquity is not of the slightest evidential value. The latter is also true, but its promotion by genuine scholars into the place of an argument might well provoke a sigh or a smile, were it not indubitable that it is precisely this age-long patient reiteration of belief and claim by the Roman Church that has had the most far-reaching psychological influence in the smothering of dissent. It is precisely this which has hypnotized even Protestant historians into an ill-advised surrender of the outer bulwarks and bastions of their own stronghold. To the ecclesiastical questions involved the classicist may properly profess himself indifferent, but not being a susceptible subject for hypnotism, he does not consider himself estopped by the insistence of either embattled host from the consideration of the historical issue between them.<sup>1</sup>

There is something, as it seems to me, slightly humorous in the idea of our professor, who in the serene intellectual atmosphere of Chicago University is provoked to sigh over the obtuseness, or to smile in pity for the weakness, of Lightfoot, Harnack and a few dozen other scholars of almost equal eminence, hypnotized into the acceptance of a claim, which, he assures them upon the faith of a "classicist" (not a susceptible subject), is based upon nothing better than incoherent sand. One wonders what Dr. Kirsopp Lake, for example, the Professor of early Christian Literature at Harvard, may think of this onslaught. Dr. Lake has not exactly made himself remarkable for excessive orthodoxy either in the field of theology or history, and yet he states in the latest edition of the "Encyclopædia Britannica":

<sup>1</sup> Merrill, *lib. cit.* pp. 274—275.

The most important and widespread tradition is that Peter came to Rome; and though this tradition has often been bitterly attacked, it seems to be probable that it is at least in outline quite historical. The evidence for it is earlier and better than that for any other tradition, though it is not quite convincing.<sup>1</sup>

Neither language of this kind, nor that used by Professor Sieffert in the Herzog-Hauck Protestant "Realencyklopädie," nor that of Bishop Chase in Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible" seems to me to show the least sign of the hypnotic influence of sentiment. In each case the matter is soberly discussed in accordance with the space available and the verdict, on historic grounds alone, is given in favour of the Roman claim. Moreover these are only cited as easily accessible representatives of a score of other non-Catholic authorities who from an equally independent standpoint have reached the same conclusion. If Professor Merrill had had any new evidence to offer, we might have listened a little more patiently to his dogmatic pronouncements, but beyond the revival of a theory as to the unauthentic character and late date of the epistle of St. Clement, he has nothing to urge but arguments which have been presented a hundred times before. So far as any fresh evidence has come to light in the researches of the past half century it has all tended to confirm, and in no respect to invalidate, the data of the Roman tradition.

It seems unnecessary and undesirable to attempt to restate the evidence which has so many times been adequately presented, and with which so many readers will already be familiar. Beginning with St. Peter's Epistle from "Babylon," which there is good reason from the language of the Apocalypse and of other early writers to identify with Rome, we may specially note the indirect reference to the martyrdom of SS. Peter and Paul contained in the letter of St. Clement to the Corinthians, of which there will be occasion to speak later. But we have also a considerable series of allusions in St. Ignatius of Antioch, St. Justin, the Judæo-Christian "Ascension of Isaiah," St. Dionysius of Corinth, St. Irenæus, Tertullian, St. Cyprian, Caius (? = St. Hippolytus), and others, which it is difficult to explain upon any other hypothesis than that the writers definitely connected the episco-

<sup>1</sup> *Encyclopædia Britannica* (11th Ed.), XXI., 287.

pate and martyrdom of St. Peter with the city of Rome itself. Dr. Edmundson states all these facts very fully and convincingly, laying, as is only right, particular stress upon the archaeological argument. But a few words may be quoted from Bishop Chase's article in Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible."

The strength [he says] of the case for St. Peter's visit to and martyrdom at Rome lies not only in the absence of any rival tradition, but also in the fact that many streams of evidence converge to this result. We have the evidence of official lists and documents of the Roman Church, which prove the strength of the tradition in later times, and which at least in some cases, must rest on earlier documents. The notice of the transference of the apostle's body to a new resting place in 258, and the words of Caius, show that the tradition was definite and unquestioned at Rome in the first half of the third century. The fact that Caius is arguing with an Asiatic opponent, the evidence of the (Gnostic) Acts of Peter, the passages quoted from Origen, Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian, show that at the same period the tradition was accepted in the Churches of Asia, of Alexandria and Carthage. The passage of Irenæus carries the evidence backward well within the second century, and is of special importance as coming from one who had visited Rome, whose list of Roman bishops suggests that he had had access to official documents, and who through Polycarp was in contact with the personal knowledge of St. John and his companions.<sup>1</sup>

This Anglican summary of the case was first printed in 1900 and it gives a good outline of the evidence which Lightfoot and Harnack had before them when forming their conclusions regarding St. Peter's Roman episcopate. Since then, however, the excavations made under the basilica of San Sebastiano on the Appian Way have supplied fresh materials, at any rate in the domain of archæology, and one is glad to call attention to such an admirably lucid account of these discoveries in popular language as that provided in the brochure just issued of M. l'Abbé Chéramy. It will have been noticed in the quotation which has just been made that

<sup>1</sup> Hastings, "Dictionary of the Bible," III., 777; the article was written by Dr. F. H. Chase, then Principal of the Clergy Training School, Cambridge, and subsequently, from 1905 to 1924, Bishop of Ely.



Bishop Chase refers to "the transference of the Apostle's body to a new resting place in 258." We cannot affirm that this translation, which was in any case only of a temporary character, is an absolutely certain fact. It is rather an inference based upon an entry in the Philocalian calendar of 354, when combined with an entry in the martyrology known as the Hieronymianum, the epitaph of Pope Damasus and some other early documents. To discuss the whole question of this translation would take us too far. It must be sufficient to say, for the benefit of those unfamiliar with the discussion, that according to the view now most generally accepted by the Roman archæologists, the bodies both of St. Peter and St. Paul were in the year 258 conveyed from their respective tombs beside the Vatican and on the Ostian Way to some hiding place, "ad catacumbas," on the Appian road, close to the site where the basilica of St. Sebastian now stands. The main object with which the excavations of 1915—1922 were undertaken was to find this hiding place, or at any rate, some trace of it, but in this respect the investigation does not seem to have been crowned with success. There was found, however, the basin or hollow (κύμβη) in the tufa, from which the now familiar name "catacomb" is derived. The place was called "ad catacumbas" because its most conspicuous original feature was a series of sepulchral chambers constructed in the tufa beside a natural depression in the ground (κατὰ κύμβας). These tombs seem to have been used for pagan interments down to about the year 238 A.D., but it is not clear that they were exclusively pagan, for in one or two places Christian emblems, the fish and the anchor, were found, and in one spot the word ἰχθύς (fish) was clearly inscribed, the intruding T, taller than the other letters, being apparently intended as a symbol of the cross.<sup>1</sup> At some time in the first half of the second century, a villa was built on the top of the bank or cliff of tufa, but rather more than a century later, and consequently about

<sup>1</sup> For the fullest account and the best illustrations of the discoveries made, see the "Atti della R. Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei," Serie V., Vol. XX., fasc. 1—3, where the matter is discussed from the archæological and the Christian point of view by G. Mancini (pp. 3—79) and O. Marucchi (pp. 80—103). But there are other excellently illustrated articles elsewhere, as, for example, in the "Römische Quartalschrift," for 1915 and subsequently; in the "Nuovo Bolletino d'Archeologia Sacra," 1918—1922; in Styger's booklet, "Il Monumento apostolico della via Appia" (1917); and in that of the Abbé Chéramy, "Saint-Sébastien hors les Murs" (1925), cited at the head of this article. For the purposes of the general reader the illustrations in the work last named will be found quite adequate.

the year 250, this villa was pulled down again and close beside the place where it stood a chamber, open on one side to the air was constructed, which has come to be known as the "tricia," *i.e.*, refectory. From its decorations and from other indications it was clearly a place intended for meetings of a more or less convivial and ceremonial character. The special interest it offers for the Christian archæologist is provided by the *graffiti* (scribblings) scratched upon the plaster, which here and there in patches still remains upon the walls. It can be affirmed with some confidence that these *graffiti* must belong to the second half of the third century. Before 356 the "tricia" was pulled down and some of the materials used as rubble to fill up the hollow, over, or at any rate close beside, which the primitive basilica, now known as San Sebastiano, was erected at that date. The *chi-rho* emblem distinctive of the Constantinian era is nowhere seen and the character of the writing, though a poor criterion in the case of the promiscuous and probably uneducated crowd who scrawled their pious sentiments upon the plaster, is everywhere in accord with what we might expect to find about the year 260. But it is the nature of the scribblings themselves which forms the point of main importance. Here are a few specimens:

Petro et Paulo Tomius Cœlius refrigerium feci.

XIII Kal. Apriles refrigerium feci et nos in Deo omnes.

Paule ed Petre petite pro Victore.

Paule Petre petite pro Erate, rogare.

X Kal. Paule Petre in mente habete Sozomenum.

Petrus et Paulus in mente abeatis Antonius Bassum

. . . nius et in mente abete Gelasius.

Dalmatius botum is promisit refrigerium.

At Paulo et Pet . . . refrigeravi.

And so on indefinitely.

These spontaneous and often quite illiterate appeals point clearly to a great popular cultus of SS. Peter and Paul at this spot. Most are written in Latin, a few in Greek, but the Latin is often scrawled in Greek letters. As already noticed, the plaster only remains in patches, and many of the scribblings are illegible, but in the case of nearly 80 the names of both Apostles can be discerned, sometimes that of Peter standing first, sometimes that of Paul. There can be no possible

question that somewhere during the latter half of the third century, and consequently in close accord with the Philo-calian entry which commemorates a translation, or at any rate a festival celebration, of the two Apostles "ad catacumbas" in 258, there existed precisely in that spot a vigorous popular devotion to the two great Roman patrons conjointly, the evidence of which remains to this day.<sup>1</sup> That St. Paul preached in Rome and died there is disputed by practically no one. Why should we suppose that of the two Apostles so associated the tradition in one case should be authentic and in the other purely apocryphal?<sup>2</sup>

A word must be added upon the meaning of the terms *refrigerium* and *refrigeravimus* which appear in so many of the scribblings. There can be no doubt, as the late Father Grossi Gondi, S.J., has shown in a learned paper contributed to the "Römische Quartalschrift," that this terminology refers to a practice which can hardly be distinguished from that of the primitive "agape," or love feast, familiar to the early Christians. In imitation of the Last Supper in which our Saviour bade His disciples "do these things in commemoration of Me," it seems that for some time the idea prevailed that the consecration of the bread and wine in the Eucharist was meant to be preceded by a repast. This involved the gathering together of rich and poor, and it probably took the form of the provision of a gratuitous meal by which the more indigent among the faithful largely benefited. Before long the close connection of this repast with the celebration of the liturgy was found to lead to abuses, and when the body of the faithful became more numerous it was discontinued. Still it seems to have been maintained for some time on certain occasions and more particularly in connection with the rites practised in commemoration of the departed, and, where possible, it took place in close proximity to the spot where their mortal remains were laid to rest. There were many pagan analogies to the practice, and it was undoubtedly a principle in the early Church not to break too abruptly, with customs, innocent in themselves, which were endeared to the people by long usage, but rather to Christianize them

<sup>1</sup> See especially Chéramy, "Saint-Sebastien," pp. 58-61.

<sup>2</sup> Chéramy states (p. 82 note) that in the April of this year, 1925, Mgr. Wilpert announced the discovery—apparently at San Sebastiano—of two fragments of sarcophagi, one depicting the martyrdom of St. Paul, the other St. Peter's miraculous draught of fish. I gather that both fragments date from the third century.

and give them a religious colouring. These repasts, then, in honour of the dead were maintained for some centuries, and though ecclesiastical authority in the end found it necessary to suppress them, the institution was a popular one, and under favourable conditions was not discouraged. One of the words most commonly applied to it was *refrigerium* (refreshment), and it may be noted that the phrase occurs more than once with an analogous connotation of this kind in the Acts of St. Perpetua. When, therefore, we find a *graffito* reading "Dalmatius botum (=votum) is (*i.e.*, Petro et Paulo) promisit refrigerium," it means that "Dalmatius promised to Peter and Paul a funeral repast as a binding obligation." Similarly "At (= ad) Paulo et Petro refrigeravi" is simply the equivalent of "I made a feast in honour of Paul and Peter." I will only remark before quitting this subject of the excavations at the basilica of San Sebastiano that the church was originally known as the basilica of the Apostles "ad catacumbas," the dedication to St. Sebastian coming into use later when the remains of the famous martyr were enshrined there. On the other hand the cemetery close beside this church was in the Middle Ages practically the only one of these underground burying places which was known to and visited by the faithful. "Catacumba" in this way was sometimes, though very rarely, used as a generic term to designate such labyrinths of subterranean passages—we find it in the tenth century applied to a similar cemetery at Naples—but it is only in quite modern times that the designation has been employed familiarly to denote all the sepulchral tunnellings of this class.

I have left myself but little space to refer to another piece of research of a quite different order which has recently been published and which lends most valuable support to the traditional argument for St. Peter's Roman episcopate. Almost the only point in Professor Merrill's volume which offers even the appearance of novelty is his attempt to undermine the force of the allusion made to the martyrdom of the two Apostles, Peter and Paul, in St. Clement's epistle to the Corinthians. This letter has by almost all critics been accepted as a document belonging—at latest—to the final decade of the first century, and as an authentic missive despatched by the Bishop of Rome, the third in succession from St. Peter, to the Church of Corinth which had consulted him. When, therefore, we find Pope Clement coupling the mar-

tyrdom of St. Peter with that of St. Paul, and implying that they at Rome had a just claim to appeal to the example of both these champions of the Faith, it is plain that a very strong presumption exists that Pope Clement regarded St. Peter in the same light as the mediæval pilgrims who set out to visit the "limina Apostolorum" in the mother city of Christendom. To this Mr. Merrill replies that Clement is in all probability a fabulous personage, that the letter attributed to him is not older than the year 140 A.D. and that the parallelisms which have been detected between Clement's letter and that of St. Polycarp are not due, as has hitherto been argued by Lightfoot and others, to the fact that Polycarp had St. Clement's letter before him and copied its phrases, but that conversely the letter of Polycarp was used by the forger to supply suitable material for his fabrication. In reply to this very hazardous and desperate contention, Dom B. Capelle in the April number of the "*Revue Bénédictine*" has submitted the passages in question to a careful scrutiny and has shown that while most of the clauses appealed to in both documents bear a close relation to the phraseology of the New Testament, the wording of St. Clement's letter points unmistakably to the conclusion that it was intermediate between the New Testament and the epistle of Polycarp; not vice versa.<sup>1</sup> In order to do justice to the learned Benedictine's argument it would be necessary to quote the relative passages in the original Greek and to enter into rather lengthy explanations, but the reader who is interested in the subject will do well to consult the article itself, and will find in it yet another proof of the extremely rash and irresponsible methods which characterize the diatribe of the Professor of Latin in the University of Chicago.

HERBERT THURSTON.

<sup>1</sup> "*Revue Bénédictine*," April, 1925—"La prima Clementis et l'épître de Polycarpe," pp. 283—287.

## THE DISSIDENT EAST

**I**T would be absurd, if not impious, to suppose that Almighty God, speaking to us in these last days through His Son, should not thus have chosen an instrument capable of effecting His purpose in all the ages and amidst all the races of men. His final and perfect means of revelation must surely be adaptable in its substance to the mentality of the cultivated and of the simple, of the phlegmatic and of the ardent, of the West and of the East. There is nothing in the nature of things to suggest that certain races or certain temperaments or certain stages of development, always supposing a certain minimum of intelligence, are genuinely incapable of receiving the Gospel message. If there are any minds *de facto* impervious to divine truth, it will be those of the proud and self-sufficient from whom God hides what He discloses to little ones. But, in general, our Lord would have His Gospel preached to every creature and the fact that He assigns a penalty for non-acceptance, implies a native and universal capacity for receiving.

Accordingly the Catholic, a member of Christ's universal Church, is far from looking upon the religious divisions which afflict Christendom as in any way inevitable, as due to innate differences of outlook or character rather than to the misuse of human free will. The Eastern Orthodox are not in schism because of some necessarily antagonistic quality of the Roman mentality: the existence of Uniate churches all over the East is sufficient proof to the contrary. The Northern nations were not forced to revolt from Rome because their expanding genius and zeal for freedom could no longer be confined within the bounds of dogmatic obscurantism: the Church reacted to and absorbed what was good in the New Learning as she had done in regard to the Old. No, Christ's ideal of one visible Church for all mankind—one Flock and one Shepherd; one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism—has so far failed of fulfilment, for the same reason as His complete subjugation of the individual human heart is foiled or delayed; the free choice by the human will of some other apparently preferable good. Were it not for the ambitions and enmities of Photius and of Michael Cerularius the Eastern



nations in whose bosom the Church was cradled might not have left her unity, and, as for the Reformation, who now doubts that it was personal or political motives rather than pure religious zeal that caused that outbreak? As a matter of fact, fervent Catholics have witnessed to the faith in every clime: there have been modern Catholic martyrs in Japan, China, Korea, Uganda, Canada, as valiant as those that fell in the Coliseum or at Tyburn. The remarkable spread of Catholicism in the United States, the most progressive and the most mundane of nations, shows that it rises superior to every *milieu*. The Church alone responds to the deepest and most persistent needs of human nature—the desire of personal survival and perfect happiness. In the Church man becomes God's child with an assurance of a share in the family inheritance.

Out of some obscure recognition of this fact has arisen the modern movement to go back on the Reformation, to do away with merely national Churches, to regain the lost unity of Christendom. That movement finds resistance in the more particularist bodies, but on the whole it advances, and nowhere is it more manifest or more singular than in the relations between Anglicanism and the Orthodox. We Catholics hold with the certainty of faith that there can be no reunion of Christendom unless by a return to Christ's original plan, an entrance into His Church, an acceptance of the whole of His revelation as taught and guaranteed by that Church. Mere external federation of dissimilar bodies retaining their diverse views and their local autonomies cannot satisfy the needs of the occasion. The League against Rome, which Pan-Protestants aim at, is a mere dream, for there is no spiritual bond of union in Protestantism. Nor would any fusion between Anglican and Orthodox, even were fusion possible, make for real Christian unity, since they have not, nor can they evolve, the necessary principle of cohesion, a single living Authority. But recent events—the culmination of a long series—make the gradual *rapprochement* of the Eastern Churches with the English a matter of intense interest to the Catholic. For he sees principles at work and assumptions made which he knows to be false, and he hopes that their falsity may become more and more manifest to the profit of truth.

The sixteenth centenary of the first Ecumenical Council, that of Nicæa (325 A.D.), formed an auspicious occasion for

an attempt to return to Christian fellowship, for then it was that the unity and universality of the Church were exhibited dramatically for the first time. Not that these notes had previously been in question, any more than had the doctrine of our Lord's divinity which was therein declared a revealed dogma, but, for the first time in history, a striking demonstration was made before the eyes of the world of the identity in faith of East and West. It is true that few Western bishops were present though all were invited; still one of those, Hosius of Cordova, spoke and voted and signed first in the name of the Western Patriarchate and probably with the commission of the Pope. And of course, the doctrine formally and finally branded by the Council as blasphemous and false, that of Arius, denying the consubstantial Godhead of Christ, marks the chief distinction between all man-made religions, and that set up to last for ever by the God-Man. "What think ye of Christ? Whose Son is He?"—has ever been the test-question separating the sheep from the goats, Catholics from Arians, in every age. And it serves still to distinguish amongst the sects those who will accept a miraculously-conditioned revelation from those who think that religion, like other provinces of human culture, "evolved" under the action of natural laws. The denial of the full divinity of Christ naturally carries with it doubts of His power, His knowledge, even of His goodness, and leads the heretic into the fogs and swamps of Modernism. For only God could set up a Church officered by fallible and mortal men, and make it infallible and perpetual; only God could foresee its future and guide its development and preserve it from error and defeat for all time. Deny Christ's Godhead, and there is nothing left but a horde of antagonistic "Churches," choosing their beliefs by arbitrary standards, and incapable of unity because guided in the last resort by private judgment.

Whether spontaneously, then, or in response to an invitation, several Eastern Orthodox prelates joined with the Anglican Church in celebrating the Centenary of Nicæa. There was talk, earlier in the year, of holding an Eastern Ecumenical Council at Jerusalem to which the Anglican Church was to be invited, but the project has not materialized, probably owing to the Soviet persecution of the Russians. The Westminster Abbey celebration may have been designed

as a substitute for the more elaborate event. Anyhow there journeyed to England, Photius, Patriarch of Alexandria,<sup>1</sup> and Damianos, Patriarch of Jerusalem, with lesser dignitaries, such as Archbishop Timotheus of the Jordan and the Metropolitan of Nubia. Joined with these and representing the dispersed Russian Church were Antony, Metropolitan of Kiev, Eulogius, who is supreme Bishop over the *émigrés*, and the Bishop of Sevastopol. Germanos, Archbishop of Thyatira, who has been resident in London for several years, also took part in the celebrations. This visit marks the culminating point of the intercourse between Anglicanism and the East, which began as long ago as 1628 when Cyril Lukaris, Patriarch of Constantinople, sent the "Codex Alexandrinus" as a present to Charles I. Latterly the overtures to the East have come mainly from the "Anglo-Catholic" party and have met with considerable success, owing to that party's insistence on the view that there can be Catholicism without the Pope, which is also of the essence of the Orthodox belief. The Orthodox Church professes to hold the golden mean between the extremes of Romanism and Protestantism, and that is the position too which is fondly claimed by "Anglo-Catholics." In their dealings with the Orthodox, they recognize their orthodoxy. There is no summons to abandon errors, such as comes from Rome and would come from Protestantism if that creed had one head instead of a thousand: there is a simple plea to be recognized as a sister Church. How welcome a change from the incessant (and successful) "proselytizing" of Rome, and the Bible-Christianity preached by the Protestant sects. In the Bonn Conferences of 1874—5, when the Old Catholics endeavoured to strengthen their cause by bringing Anglicans and Orthodox into communion, the Protestantism of the Establishment was not effectively disguised, and there was little result. But the "Anglo-Catholics" have made a much better showing, and for the past thirty or forty years there has been a growing *communicatio in sacris* between the two bodies, not always stopping short of actual public giving and reception

<sup>1</sup> The full official title of this prelate which even his Anglican admirers failed to give him, is "Father and Pastor, Pope and Patriarch, Father of Fathers, Pastor of Pastors, Bishop of Bishops, Thirteenth Apostle, Judge of the Universe." It comes as a shock to learn that, before the influx of Greeks into Egypt under the English administration, this rival of the "Servus servorum Dei" ruled over a flock of about 10,000 with the aid of four Bishops without Sees. The present Patriarch has ten times as large a flock and an established hierarchy. See *The Papacy: The Separated Eastern Churches*, p. 59.

of the Eucharist.<sup>1</sup> Some at any rate of the independent Eastern Churches have gone to this length, but their conduct is not approved by all. Not that the "Anglo-Catholics" would hesitate for a moment to receive Communion from the Orthodox, and administer it to them. The reluctance is wholly on the other side.

It is a standing marvel to Catholics that these venerable and intelligent men should, consistently with their professed beliefs, allow themselves to go so far as they do. It did not need the explicit "Open Letter," addressed to the Russian prelates and printed in *The Tablet* for June 27th, wherein a Russian convert warned his former pastors, not for the first time, of the heretical character of Anglicanism as a whole, to set them on their guard. These able men must surely know all about Bishop Barnes and Dean Inge: they must know that, quite apart from the Modernists, the whole of Evangelical Anglicanism represented by Bishop Knox and Sir W. Joynson-Hicks look upon them with little less religious aversion than they do the blinded followers of the Pope. What possible answer, save a shamed and discreditable silence, have they to the dilemma, so remorselessly presented by *The Tablet* (July 11th), of being either stupidly ignorant of notorious facts or of compromising their faith by religious association with heretics? The scandal as we have implied above, is of long standing, and may possibly be explained as due to the somewhat vague character of Orthodox theology and to the absence of any authoritative guidance amongst the various national Churches which combine in the Orthodox Faith. The two causes operate conjointly. As is well known, the title, "The Orthodox Eastern Church," gives a false impression of unity to a number of autonomous national Churches, severally grouped under four ancient Patriarchates,—Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem. After the final breach with Rome in 1054, these Patriarchates became practically independent of each other, although to Constantinople was given a primacy of honour. Long before the schism the Russian Church, technically under Constantinople, was by far the largest and most powerful of the Eastern Churches, and, for at least a century after the revolt of her patriarch, remained attached to Rome. In

<sup>1</sup> A report in *The Church Times* for July 3rd made allusion to the fact that the Eastern Prelates in Westminster Abbey removed their head-dresses "just before the Consecration": elsewhere in the same issue it is recorded that whilst "Jerusalem" has acknowledged Anglican Orders, "Alexandria" has not. One cannot base an argument on what was, in any case, an act of courtesy.

1589 a Patriarchate was established at Moscow and the Russian Church became independent of Constantinople, only to be thoroughly Erastianized by Peter the Great who in 1721 abolished the Patriarchate and established the Holy Synod, as a Government department, in its stead. Just as Constantinople fell under the civil sway of the Turk, so the Russian Church became subject to the hardly less odious tyranny of the Czar. And yet these bodies boast, or boasted, that they are free from the yoke of Rome!

Since the schism eleven other autocephalic Churches have grown up within the bounds of Orthodoxy, all at the expense of Constantinople. The jurisdiction of "New Rome" is limited to Turkish territory, which in God's mercy has gradually grown less in Europe. The principle has become recognized, in default of any power of opposing it, of allowing each distinct nation to be ecclesiastically independent. All these Churches are in communion with one another and with Constantinople, except Bulgaria, which was excommunicated in the seventies "for aggression" by the Patriarch of Constantinople and is now in communion with Russia alone. All these Churches profess the same faith, use the same liturgy (although in various languages), and with the above exception admit each other to the Sacraments. The history of their gradual emergence is one of incessant and very bitter quarrels, accentuated by national rivalries and interferences from the civil power. The Holy Synod, with the Empire behind it, naturally aspired to the *de jure* as well as the *de facto* hegemony of Orthodoxy. The Constantinople objective of Russian policy had a religious side. Moscow was to be "the third Rome" as Constantinople had been the second. The latter Patriarchate, on the other hand, always occupied by a Greek, bitterly resented the uprising of independent Churches which followed the gradual emancipation of the Balkans from the Turk. The racial quarrels of Greek and Slav, stimulated for his own ends by their Mohammedan ruler, accentuated the clashing of jurisdictions, till during the whole nineteenth century Orthodox history became a miserable tale of un-Christian violence and intrigue. The Byzantine and Russian Churches had their origin in rebellion against lawful spiritual authority, and their punishment from that day to this has been mutual hostility and subjugation to a tyrannous civil power.

Since the war the state of Orthodoxy has in many ways

become worse. In Russia proper under the Soviets the Holy Synod has, of course, been destroyed, and in its stead have sprung up some half-dozen competing Churches, of various degrees of heterodoxy.<sup>1</sup> Outside Russia, the Church has been reorganized as thoroughly as possible. In the States set free from the old Empire—Finland, Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Georgia, and the three little republics south of the Caucasus—the Orthodox hierarchy according to principle has proclaimed its independence, and so there are nine autocephalic Churches to replace the five destroyed by the political changes in the Balkans. Constantinople, not sorry to assert itself now that its powerful rival is for a time powerless, has sanctioned these changes in spite of the protests of the Russian hierarchy. The Russian *émigrés* are ruled practically by a Synod at Carlowitz in Serbia, of which Archbishop Antony of Kiev is the President.<sup>2</sup>

Such in rough summary is the present condition of Orthodoxy. Can we wonder that a "Church" so loosely constructed, so rent by racial and national hostilities, so corrupted by Erastianism, so persecuted both by the infidel and the believer throughout its history, should not have developed a consistent theological tradition? Compelled by circumstances to seek guidance in Scriptures, Councils and Fathers alone, severed by human perversity from the Living Authority that guarantees and interprets the written tradition, the wonder rather is that Orthodoxy has preserved so much of the true Faith, and has not slipped into more grievous errors than we find. Cut off from the Church two centuries before St. Thomas wrote, the Easterns have never since produced any great philosophers or theologians. Dogmatic theology must needs make use of some sound and consistent philosophy. No Orthodox St. Thomas ever arose to "baptize" Aristotle for the schismatics, and the want of a definite philosophical theory has checked amongst them the natural and necessary "development of doctrine." And this, in spite of a natural keenness of intellect, so wonderfully demonstrated in the Greek Fathers, and in spite of incessant theological preoccupation, forced upon them primarily by the necessity of justifying their preposterous and unnatural schism.

<sup>1</sup> See "The Decay of Russian Orthodoxy," *THE MONTH*, January, 1924. A Patriarchate of Moscow was again constituted, after the overthrow of the Czar, with the unhappy Tykhon as first Patriarch.

<sup>2</sup> By way of reasserting the claims of his Patriarchate, Gregory VIII. of Constantinople promulgated a decree on April 30th, 1924, annulling all the ecclesiastical acts of the *émigrés* Russian Bishops.



Thus they exhibit, though in a far less marked way, the fate that has overtaken the "Churches" that revolted from Rome in the sixteenth century. In non-Catholic Christendom we similarly find great powers of intellect exercised, not in finding and furthering truth but in the vain attempt to establish multiform error. We find, especially, many subtle minds warped by the exigencies of the controversy against Rome, the need of maintaining illogical positions and of blinking inconvenient facts, into the most disingenuous theories. We find, even amongst nominal Christians, a wild riot of philosophical speculation, which not only denies the existence of objective and absolute truth but the capability of the mind to attain it. Who could ever draw up a *Summa* of Protestant or Anglican Theology which would truly represent Protestant or Anglican belief about God, or harmonize current theories with revelation? This explains the Anglican insensibility to heresy. There can be no heresy in a theological system which in the last resort allows everything to be accepted or rejected by the standard of human reason. Or rather the whole is heresy—a matter in the long run of individual choice. The most representative High Church paper, *The Church Times*,<sup>1</sup> unable to deny the fact that the English Church "comprehends" those who believe contradictory doctrines, is at constant pains to show that these are mere "schools of thought," embodying the mentalities of different temperaments, "the institutional, the liberal and the mystical." It prefers to speak of "inclusiveness" rather than of "comprehension," and seems to think that the change of term has removed the reproach. It varies<sup>2</sup> its defence by saying that Anglicanism "comprehends" both Catholics who reject the Pope and Protestants who don't adhere to any other body, thus begging the question as to whether one *can* be a Catholic and reject the Pope, and not opening the question of the "variations of Protestantism." To such quibbling is one driven when trying to explain away the absence of teaching authority in Anglicanism and its consequent inability to eject from its system those who deny even the fundamental doctrines of the Creed. Canon J. A. Douglas, writing to *The Tablet* (July 11th), calls the Modernists "our sick brethren,"<sup>3</sup> implying that they are temporarily out of

<sup>1</sup> June 25th, "Inclusiveness and Unity."

<sup>2</sup> May 22nd, "Authority and Obedience"; cf. May 29th, p. 635.

<sup>3</sup> In the height of the controversy of the "Anglo-Catholic" vicars of Birmingham with their new diocesan, Dr. Barnes, whose teaching they held to be

harmony with the faith through some defect of mind or will, but he cannot assert that this is more than his opinion or, as *The Tablet* aptly rejoins, deny that it is he and the "Anglo-Catholics" who are regarded as "sick" both by Modernists and Evangelicals. There is no authority in Anglicanism to say which is right and which wrong, and why and where. The Church of England, which honours Dr. Major, could never have expelled Arius. So much indeed the *Church Times*, in a burst of candour, owns, when, in derision of the *Guardian's* appeal to "the living voice of the English Church," it cries<sup>1</sup>—

Where is that "living voice" to be heard? In the columns of the *Guardian* or in the columns of the *Record*? From the mouth of the Bishop of London, who permits Devotions, or from the mouth of the Bishop of Southwark, who condemns them? From Mr. Kensit or Dr. Major? From the "Call to Action" or the speeches at Anglo-Catholic Congresses? We respectfully ask the *Guardian* for an explicit reply?

A safe demand as well as a respectful. Such being the case with Anglicanism, we are not surprised to find that the same lack of living doctrinal authority has had somewhat similar results in the Orthodox Church since the Schism. It is not easy to get a full constructive view of its theology. Many Western scholars have made the attempt. Not the least valuable chapters in the late Dr. Adrian Fortescue's scholarly work, "The Orthodox Eastern Church," are those devoted to "Orthodox Theology" and "The Orthodox Faith," and some of our readers may recollect the painstaking way in which he investigated in *THE MONTH*<sup>2</sup> the attitude of Orthodoxy towards Catholic Sacraments, especially that of Holy Orders. Other modern scholars have studied the writings of the Orthodox theologians only to find, amidst a substantially correct adherence to the main dogmas of Christianity, a vast deal of very bitter anti-Roman polemic, acrimonious disputes, too, amongst themselves, and not a few untenable doctrines, *e.g.*, regarding the Sacraments, original sin, the

"untheological, unhistorical and untrue," they published a manifesto which emphasizes undesignedly Anglican comprehensiveness. "Here is a marvel," they wrote, "we have not broken away from each other, and we do not wish to and do not intend to,"—thus actually claiming credit for their tolerance of heresy. (*v. Church Times*, February 6th, 1925.)

<sup>1</sup> June 19th, p. 727.

<sup>2</sup> In May and August, 1921.

prerogatives of Our Lady, purgatory. In that excellent publication, *Orientalia Christiana*, issued by the Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome, experts constantly write about Orthodox Theology,<sup>1</sup> following especially the theological works of Professor Gloubokovsky, the most able and prominent of modern Russian theologians. Another valuable summary of the faith of the Easterns comes from an Anglican Professor in the United States, the Rev. Frank Gavin, of Nashotah, Wis., who published in 1923, "Some Aspects of Contemporary Greek Orthodox Thought," an objective study of great candour and thoroughness. The conclusion of this scholar is that union between the Orthodox and the Anglican Churches is practically impossible, because in the last resort the former considers itself to be the true and only Church of Christ, and will consent to unite with no religious body which does not unfeignedly accept all its teaching: the identical attitude always and for the same reason assumed by Rome, but with much more warrant. For Rome at least knows what she teaches and claims a divinely-derived infallibility for her doctrine. Orthodoxy, as we have implied, is often vague and inconsistent and, though appealing to Scripture Councils and the Fathers, does not and cannot claim infallibility in interpreting Tradition. A case very much in point is its attitude towards Anglican Orders, the solution of which question depends partly on history, partly on sacramental doctrine. The Orthodox theory, not always consistently held and applied, is that heretical baptism itself is of doubtful validity and that, in any case, the grace of Holy Orders lapses altogether in a heretical or schismatical Church. At the Bonn Conferences the Orthodox would not allow that Anglican Orders were certainly valid. A delegation from Constantinople attended the Lambeth Conference in 1920 and afterwards sent a lengthy report in which they declared themselves not convinced<sup>2</sup> by the arguments in support of the validity of those Orders, and reserved the matter for further examination. Since then the Patriarchs of Constantinople (July, 1922), of Jerusalem (February, 1923) and the

<sup>1</sup> See, for instance, "La vraie notion d'Orthodoxie," by M. d'Herbigny, S.J., and *Conceptus et doctrina de Ecclesia juxta theologiam Orientis separati*, by Th. Spacil, S.J.

<sup>2</sup> "The members of the standing Committee . . . tried to convince us, drawing their arguments from the Book of Common Prayer, that from the dogmatic and liturgical point of view the Anglican Ordination is well-established and that it bears all the marks of the Sacrament." See "Documents on Christian Unity" (London, 1924, pp. 61-2); also Father McNabb in *Blackfriars*, August, 1922.

Archbishop of Cyprus (March, 1923) have in conjunction with their Synods declared Anglican Orders "possessed the same validity as those of the Roman, Old Catholic and Armenian Churches," and the first-named prelate sent an encyclical to "the Presidents of the Particular Eastern Orthodox Churches" recommending a consideration of the question. It seems, therefore, not improbable that in course of time Byzantine Orthodoxy at least will be of one mind in the matter. In the circumstances Russia can hardly attend to matters of the sort, though it may be noted that certain of the Slav Churches, that of Serbia, for instance, have gone far beyond any other of the dissident Eastern communities in administering to Anglicans, and receiving from them, the Eucharist. At the same time, one has to take this acceptance of Anglican Orders by certain Orthodox Churches in conjunction with their strange doctrine of "economy,"<sup>1</sup> whereby they seem to hold that, once one joins their Church, she can supply *proprio motu* any defects in the sacraments of the convert. The promise not to reordain Anglican clergymen who wish to join Orthodoxy, may mean no more than this.

Let us contrast with this hesitancy, vagueness and inability to know its own mind that Orthodoxy so often exhibits, the theological condition of other Eastern Churches which are Catholic but not "Orthodox." We must never forget that side by side with the latter all over the East, and in various parts of the world besides, there are other Churches in communion with Rome, corresponding to the various national organizations of the Greco-Slavs and also to the various heretical bodies—Copts, Nestorians, Armenians, etc.—which broke away before the Photian schism. Over these Uniates, the Pope rules, not as Patriarch of the West, but in virtue of his universal jurisdiction, derived from St. Peter. They have their own language and liturgical rites, for the most part they do not regard celibacy as a prerequisite for ordination, they vary greatly from the Latins and amongst themselves in various other disciplinary matters, but they are one in faith, worship and government with their Latin brethren. And so careful

<sup>1</sup> Not much light is cast upon the matter by the Constantinopolitan delegates to the Lambeth Conference, who say in their report ("Documents on Christian Unity," p. 68): "In answer to the requests for explanation from us we pointed out that 'Economy' has no force when it is a question of dogmatic matters and of fundamental, canonical and other points, and it is opposed to the 'strictness,' according to which all the conditions of validity and canonicity are applied." An explanation which leaves us in doubt whether the delegates themselves are very clear in the matter.

is the Roman See to preserve their ecclesiastical customs that no one may change or be induced to change the rite to which he belongs. A convert from Orthodoxy, for instance, cannot without special permission adopt the Latin rite. In these Uniate Churches, there is no uncertainty as to faith, no inconsistency of practice, no superstition in worship, no dependence on the civil power. Firmly planted on the Rock of Peter and under the mild sway of his successor, they make manifest that there is nothing in the Eastern mentality incompatible with the closest association with the Latin Patriarchate. They represent the gradual reversal of the effects of the Schism which, inflamed by political and racial rancour, has for centuries perverted Christ's ideal of the Church and condemned itself to a relative spiritual sterility. In God's providence, which has regard for good faith and invincible ignorance, the sacraments in the dissident Churches have been the medium of grace and salvation for multitudes, but how crippled and paralysed in every other respect they have been and remain, no reader of their history can fail to see.

What, then, are the prospects of union between two communities whose theology is so chaotic and mutable—between a "comprehensive" Anglicanism on the one hand and a theoretically rigid, practically temporizing, Orthodoxy on the other? Of the rigidity there can be no doubt. There are many authoritative declarations by Bishops and Synods and theologians that the Eastern Church is no mere part of the Church universal, but is herself the one and only Body of Christ, apart from whom all other Christians are heretics or schismatics. In regard to union with Rome, the Russian Metropolitan Antony of Kiev was lately quoted<sup>1</sup> as saying—"there can be no union between Rome and the Orthodox on equal terms but the former must submit whole-heartedly and unreservedly to the latter and must abandon altogether the doctrine of Papal authority founded on Petrine succession." Is it likely that Anglicanism would be given easier terms? Quite possibly as far as government goes, owing to the nationalist system of Orthodoxy. We can conceive of a "Autocephalous Church of the English" in communion with the Eastern or a new "Patriarchate of Canterbury" yielding only a shadowy primacy of honour to the Ecumenical See. But when we turn to doctrine another question arises. Anglicanism must first cease to be Protestant, before even that loose kind of federation could be tolerated. We do the

<sup>1</sup> *Church Times*, December 7th, 1924.

Orthodox the credit of believing that they will not abandon the Nicene Faith or give up the Sacraments, even to secure the adhesion of the Established Church of the powerful British nation. Anglicanism must shed Dr. Barnes, Dr. Headlam, and all their following, must jettison Bishop Knox, Sir Thomas Inskip and those *they* represent, must even weed out the modernizing "Anglo-Catholics," must thus shrink to quite modest dimensions, before Orthodoxy will receive her as a sister. Our readers may judge what likelihood there is of such a purging of the English Church.<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly, from the practical point of view, the visit of the Easterns and the combined service at Westminster Abbey on June 29th, unique events as they were hailed to be, will leave matters much as they were. A sympathetic leader in *The Times*<sup>2</sup> courteously warns "the leaders of the Oriental Churches" not to expect any political results, "any hopes of protection," from their visit. "It is impossible for Great Britain to play the part of universal knight-errant. . . . We must make no promises that we cannot fulfil and utter no threats against Governments with which we are at peace." And it goes on to hint that religious union may not be so feasible as they anticipated. "The Patriarchs will have learnt that some who were most eager to represent the English Church to them in the past have led them astray. They will have seen that Church as it really is."

If only they could have made a visit to Rome "without prejudice," and seen *that* Church as it really is, they would surely have reaped greater profit, even in the material order, than their English visit brought them. The barrier between them and the Holy See, if only misunderstanding were removed, and ancient enmities forgotten and national pride subdued by Christian love, would vanish into nothingness. It has no foundation in reason: it never had. It is maintained by ignorance and prejudice, happily less inveterate than of old because of the uniformly considerate and conciliatory attitude of the Holy See, but still clouding many sincere minds and earnest souls. Reunion with Rome would mean for the Dissident East an immense increase of spiritual vitality, an end to factious domestic disputes, and a final emancipation from the civil encroachments which have so long hampered its missionary zeal.

JOSEPH KEATING.

<sup>1</sup> The whole subject is admirably analysed and discussed in Father Woodlock's "Constantinople, Canterbury and Rome" (Longmans, 1923).

<sup>2</sup> July 10th.



## FEMININE LOGIC

### (A QUESTION OF DETERMINISM)

"O undistinguish'd space of woman's will!"—*King Lear*.

"IT'S no use trying to argue that point—or any point—with my wife," said Professor Grantham,—“like all women she's totally incapable of following a train of thought to its logical issue. Their minds aren't built that way.”

“Don't take any notice of him, Dr. Perkins,” said the lady referred to, as she leaned over her husband's chair and stroked the long hairs that made a camouflage of growth over the bald top of his head, “John is always like that when the coffee is late.”

Diana Grantham was a woman of some eight-and-twenty summers—buoyant, pretty and practical. One of her main functions in life was fetching her husband back from the Pliocene Age (where he spent most of his time) to perform some urgent duty in the present, such as going to his lectures, or sitting on a Coal Commission, or putting on a forgotten tie.

John Grantham was a University Professor of Geology, and a man of wide reputation in his own sphere. On the question of the Development of Tertiary Mammals he spoke with an authority greater than that of any other man in Europe: it was only when dealing with the development of his own two representatives of the mammalian order (Joan and Tony, supposed at this moment to be asleep in the nursery) that his authority was very often of little or no account.

Professor Grantham prided himself that he looked out on life with the dispassionate self-detachment of a scientific philosopher. When things went smoothly, which they usually did under Diana's skilful guidance, he was able to play the part well enough. But as soon as anything went wrong—however slightly—he was apt to lose his temper and become unwarrantably irritated.

The coffee was late on this particular evening because the new housemaid, not being used to the cellar-kitchen steps, had tripped on them and upset the milk.

Happily, however, by the time we have added that Dr. Perkins, who has come to dinner, is the new demonstrator in

Petrology under Professor Grantham at the University, with a further note to the effect that he is a handsome, well-groomed, clean-shaven young man of about thirty—by this time the maid has already reappeared with a tray, and the Professor can get on with his coffee and ourselves with the story.

"Now you'll see, Dr. Perkins," said Diana, as she was pouring out, "John will get quite affable again—as soon as he gets his coffee—you do take sugar, don't you?—a cup of coffee changes his whole outlook on life."

"I am glad you have admitted it at last, my dear," said Professor Grantham, as he contentedly sipped his coffee.

"Admitted what?" replied Diana suspiciously.

"Why, exactly what I have been trying to prove to you this last half-hour—viz., that we are the sport of external circumstances, that there is, in fact, no such thing as free will."

"But I didn't say that, John."

"Well, not in so many words, my dear, but the gist of the matter comes to the same thing. It is all a matter of external environment. A cup of coffee turns you into an optimist; the income-tax returns make you a pessimist; an angry word, a sudden blow—and you're turned into a murderer. We *think* we are free agents, but this feeling is only one of our many illusions."

"What utter rubbish!" remarked Diana scornfully. "Don't you think so, too, Dr. Perkins?" she added, turning to her guest.

"Well, Mrs. Grantham, I grant you it does sound rather absurd on the face of it," replied the new demonstrator cautiously, "but many things take on a very different complexion when looked at through the eyes of Science."

"But that doesn't prove that Science is right though, does it?" replied Diana with a bewitching smile

"No, *in itself* it doesn't prove that science is right," continued Dr. Perkins; "what I meant rather was that Science takes into account all sorts of things which we do not ordinarily think of—as, for instance, the effects of heredity, education, social habits, ancestral instincts, subconscious motives, and so on. All these, and countless other influences outside ourselves are constantly at work upon us, and without our realizing it, determine our actions."

"Exactly!" said the Professor, rubbing his hands, well

pleased that his new subordinate had such orthodox scientific views on the subject, "That's exactly what I believe. It is all a matter of response to the stimuli of our external environment. Indeed, there is no doubt whatever that, if we were in possession of all the data . . . [here Diana interposed with a scornful "I/"] we should be able to calculate and predict exactly what any single person in the world would be doing at any given date in the future—just as infallibly as we are able to predict an eclipse of the moon."

"And yet you are always saying that 'women are the most incalculable creatures,'" put in Diana, provokingly.

"Ah, but that is only a figure of speech, my dear," replied the Professor, "just as we say, for instance, that the dahlias in the garden are putting on a spurt—as if they were making an effort of their own—when, of course, they are doing no such thing."

"Why not?" answered the incorrigible Diana, with a pretty toss of her head. "There's a mushroom under one of the stones in the garden path—quite a weeny-teeny one—the gardener showed it me to-day, and it's actually lifted a big stone right up about half an inch. I'm quite sure it couldn't have done that without a most *tremendous* effort. Poor little thing, I felt quite sorry for it. To think of all that it must have had to go through! I believe the fairies must have helped it," she went on after a pause, "probably some of those little gnomes with feathers in their peaked hats."

"Now, who's talking rubbish, I should like to know," said the Professor.

"Well, I don't think it's any more absurd than your ridiculous theory that we have no free will. Besides it's far more poetical."

"Even your beloved poets, my dear, when they are in their right minds, agree with my theory," retorted the Scientist, and went on:—

The moving finger writes, and, having writ,  
Moves on . . . nor all your piety or wit  
Can lure it back to cancel half a line,  
Nor all your tears wash out a word of it.

"Oh, Omar, he's not one of *my* beloved poets," said Diana scornfully. "Do you think I'd pay any reverence to a tipsy old debauchee like him. He only said that to salve his own conscience, and to relieve himself of the responsibility of his own none too virtuous actions."

"Speaking of poetry," put in Dr. Perkins at this point—he was beginning to feel embarrassed at the somewhat acrid tone the conversation was taking—"I heard rather a good Limerick on this question a short time ago."

"Oh, do tell us," said Diana eagerly, "I'm shamelessly fond of Limericks."

So Perkins began:—

There was a young man who said "D—n,"  
At last I know just what I am;  
I'm fated to move  
In a predestined groove—  
Not, therefore, a bus but a tram!

Diana clapped her hands. "I think that's just wonderful, Dr. Perkins. Almost thou persuadest me to be a 'determinist.' If I were one *that* would be my creed, and I should say it over and over to myself, and (in discreet company!) to others. But, of course, I couldn't *really* believe it for a minute, for I know I'm a 'bus' and not a 'tram.'"

"How do you know it, if I may ask?" replied the young Petrologist. "I wish I was as sure."

"Oh, I just know it," replied Diana comprehensively. "Don't you know the feeling, when you are making an important decision, that it's just *you* who are doing it and no one and nothing else?"

"There you go again!" snorted the Professor contemptuously. "'Feelings!' That's a woman all over; women always go by their feelings, instead of listening to the voice of reason."

"You may say what you like, John, but I *know* I am right" (here she emphasized her words by a slight stamp of her foot), "and what's more some day I'll prove it to you."

"You'll have to put forward better reasons than you have done to-night, my dear, before you can convince *me*."

"There *must* be some reason for it, I'm sure," she went on, half to herself, "because it's so obvious: I'll find out about it, and somehow or other I'll prove it to you."

"You may try, my dear, but I bet you you won't convince *me*."

"I will; how much do you bet on it?" said Diana, who was nothing if not practical.

"Oh, anything you like," answered the Professor confidently.

"Will you bet me that little two-seater car I've been asking you to get for me for the last ever so long?"

"You can hardly call it a bet unless you guarantee me something in return, if you fail; but we won't trouble about that," said her husband with a magnanimous air. "If you can convince me that you act like a 'bus' and not a 'tram' (in the sense of Dr. Perkins' Limerick) then I will promise, as a reward, to present you with the little bus you have set your heart on."

"Good!" replied Diana. "And, Dr. Perkins, you are witness," she added, turning to her visitor.

"And now, what about a little music, my dear," said the host, "I'm sure Dr. Perkins is fond of music, and I expect he sings."

After an appropriate amount of discussion and persuasion, it was discovered that Dr. Perkins did sing, and sang very well. Diana, too, was very fond of music, and was an expert pianist; so before long she and her guest were busy exploring the music cabinet, discovering and trying over their common favourites.

About half an hour later the drawing-room door slowly opened and there appeared two small figures clad in white pyjamas. It was Joan and Tony, aged seven and five respectively.

"My dears!" exclaimed Diana, "what *are* you doing down here? And what *do* you mean by running about the house like that; you ought to have been asleep hours ago." As she spoke the two children came running towards her.

"Oh, but Mummy, it's *so* small and frightened," said Joan, looking down at something which she held in her arms; "it was all wet and draggly when we found it first, but it's dry now."

"I dried it on my towel," put in Tony cheerfully, "it was very dirty and muddy, but it's quite clean now."

"Oh, do listen it's purring! Mummy, *mayn't* we keep it?" added Joan quickly, as soon as Tony had finished his sentence.

"Wherever did you find it?" queried Diana, bending over to examine the kitten more closely.

"We heard it outside in the night crying dweadfully for its Mummy," explained Tony, looking up at his mother with his big serious blue eyes, "and its Mummy didn't hear it and nobody didn't hear it; so at last we went down on to the lawn and gotted it ourselves. It's a norfun," he added explicitly, after a moment's pause.

"You will let us keep it, won't you, Mummy," said Joan, putting her arm round her mother, "it's such a ducky, wee thing; and we've got a name for it and everything. We've called it Dr. Perkins 'cos it came the same night as he did—only we shall call it 'Perk' for short." At this there was a general laugh amongst the grown-ups, Dr. Perkins joining in as heartily as anyone.

"It *is* rather sweet, isn't it, John," said Diana, caressing the kitten, which by this time she had taken into her own hands. "Don't you think so, Dr. Perkins?"

"Very," replied the visitor, pleased that they had named their pet after him, for it seemed somehow as if it made another link between him and this delightful family.

"I think we had better keep it, don't you, John?" said Diana. "It will be nice for the children to play with."

For once in a way the Professor was firm and put down his foot at once. "My dear, I absolutely forbid you to bring another creature into the house; already we've got two cats, a dog, and numberless rabbits, not to mention a goat and a parrot. When you marry, Dr. Perkins," he went on, turning to the latter, "don't choose a wife who is fond of animals, unless you want to have your house turned into a permanent menagerie."

"But what *are* we to do with it, John?" persisted Diana.

"Put it outside again, of course," answered the Professor.

"Oh, but we couldn't do that on a night like this. I should feel like King Lear's daughters."

"Well, Tom will have to drown it to-morrow, that's all."

"Oh, Daddy, Daddy," said the agonized Joan, as the tears began to gather in her reproachful eyes, "*please* don't."

"Well, what are we to do?" went on Diana. "Can *you* suggest anything, Dr. Perkins," she added, smiling at him. "You don't happen to know of anyone that wants a cat, do you?"

It was at this moment that Joan was suddenly inspired. "I know," she said eagerly. "Dr. Perkins, will *you* take him—he's named after you, you know; you're his patron saint, so you ought to look after him."

Dr. Perkins laughed. "That's the first time that anyone has called me a saint, and I expect it will be the last."

"Do please take him," implored Joan, and then the quaint little figure, in her white pyjama-suit, went over towards him and impulsively seized his hand in both hers.



As a consequence, when the Petrologist went back to his rooms that night after an unusually enjoyable evening, he carried with him the orphan kitten in a basket. At the same time he carried—in his not yet petrified heart—a very vivid picture of Diana's blue eyes and pretty face.

The new demonstrator turned out to be a great success, socially as well as scientifically, and it was not long before he became a frequent guest at his Chief's house.

It was discovered soon that Dr. Perkins played the fiddle, and many were the evenings that he and Diana spent together at this pastime. It suited Professor Grantham admirably to see his wife so happily and suitably entertained, for he now felt free to slip away to his study to bury himself in his monumental work on "The Development of the Tertiary Mammals."

Diana was a very keen golfer. After her marriage she had with much difficulty persuaded her husband to take up the game also. He was duly enrolled as a member of the local club, and made sporadic efforts to become proficient at it for his wife's sake—though it must be confessed with little enough success.

Perkins, on the other hand, was an enthusiastic golfer, and played the game with a zeal that was almost religious. So here again the Professor was glad to have somebody to come to his assistance, one who undertook as a pleasure what he had always regarded as a duty merely. Diana, for her part, was well pleased, instead of having to goad on her reluctant husband, to play with a substitute so willing, so able and so entertaining.

And so matters went on for several months, until it seemed almost as though Dr. Perkins had become one of the members of the Grantham family, so constant were his visits to their house. Every week, too, and often several times in the week, he went off to the links with Diana.

It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that before long people began to comment on the intimacy that had sprung up between Dr. Perkins and "that pretty, young Mrs. Grantham," till after a time it became the talk of the town.

One day, late in the summer term, the Professor received an anonymous letter, warning him to keep "a vigilant eye on someone, whose intimacy with his wife was becoming

a public scandal." The letter was typed, and signed, "From an Old Friend."

At first he thought of showing it to Diana, but he was rather afraid it might cause a scene, a thing he detested above all things. And anyhow Perkins would be going away on his long vacation in a week or so's time, when matters would ease off of their own accord. However, he registered a mental note to have a straight talk with Diana on the subject, when the next suitable opportunity presented itself.

About a week after he had received the letter, he came home one day later than usual, having been detained at the College at a long meeting of the Senate. On the table in the hall he found a note addressed to him. It was in Diana's handwriting. He opened it, casually enough, and began to read. He could scarcely believe his eyes. It ran:—

My dear John,

I am going away—for good—for your good and mine. I cannot stand the farce of our married life any longer.

We have become strangers to each other. You do not understand me, or sympathize with anything I do, think or say. All the time you are shut away with your musty old books and fossils, and you care far more for them than you do for me. You never take me out anywhere,—to a theatre, or a dance, or on the links—not even for a walk.

I cannot bear this existence any longer. By the time you get this, I shall have gone off with my real affinity—Dr. Perkins. *He* never feels bored in my company, never reproaches me nor makes fun of me nor misunderstands me. *He* is not too clever to condescend to play games with a stupid person like me; and the more I see of him the more I love him.

I do not think you have been intentionally cruel to me—only insupportably selfish and dull.

We are spending to-night at the Hotel Metropole, in London; and the next evening we shall be in Paris. So you will have all the evidence that is required for such cases.

The children and nurse have gone down to stay with Granny at Elmfield until you decide what arrangements you are going to make.

I hope your book on the Tertiary Mammals will be a

great success. I am sure it will be, and will more than compensate you for the loss of—

Yours sincerely,

Diana.

The Professor was dumbfounded. So the vile rumour had been right after all. Curse that blackguard, Perkins! Curse his Tertiary Mammals! Curse his own carelessness! Curse everything!

He rang the bell for the maid. Upon inquiry she informed him that her mistress had gone out in a taxi that morning about eleven o'clock, and had not returned since.

He looked at his watch. With a bit of luck he might catch the 8.50 train, the last to town. He 'phoned for a taxi, and in a few minutes was dashing at full speed to the station. He was just in time for the train, and sinking back into a corner seat, took the letter out again and read it through half a dozen times.

It was shortly after eleven when he reached the hotel. Going straight to the office he inquired if there was anyone of the name of Perkins staying there.

With a maddening deliberation the attendant ran his fingers down the pages of the fateful book; it seemed hours before he spoke. "'ere you are, sir, Perkins, room 357. Came in this afternoon."

As the lift went up the Professor's heart seemed to sink correspondingly. At last it stopped, and he was shot out on to the top landing. He wandered through a maze of passages until at length he found himself standing opposite door number 357.

He listened; there was not a sound. He knocked, no answer. He knocked again, louder. There was a sound in the room as of someone moving quickly. Then a voice—Diana's—near the door, saying, "Who is there?"

A panic fear suddenly gripped his heart that if he gave his own name, she might not open the door.

With a sudden and desperate inspiration he disguised his voice with a preternatural gruffness, and said, "A telegram for you, Madam."

To his great relief he heard the key in the lock and the door was opened a few inches. The Professor pushed it quickly wide open and walked in. As Diana recognized him

she started back a few steps in surprise, and then stood staring at her husband with a frightened expression. The Professor observed with relief that she appeared to be the only occupant of the room, which was a large double-bedded one.

"What the devil does all this mean, Diana?" he said in an angry tone of voice. She made no reply, but continued looking fixedly at him, as though she was still too surprised and frightened to reply. He took the letter out of his pocket and waved it in a threatening manner in front of her face. "Did you write this?" he went on fiercely. Diana seemed to pull herself together, and looking him straight in the face, replied calmly, "Yes, I did."

"Have you gone mad, or what do you mean?"

"That's what I mean," she replied, pointing to the letter which was still in his hand.

"Where's that skunk, Perkins?"

Diana said nothing, but slightly shrugged her shoulders. The next moment there was an unmistakable sound as of someone moving in the large wardrobe at one side of the room. They both heard it. As though involuntarily, Diana glanced quickly and furtively over her shoulder in that direction, then turned to meet her husband's gaze. The frightened, hunted look in her eyes increased, whilst the Professor's eyes began to blaze with all the fury of the thoroughly aroused male, ready to fight for its mate.

He was making towards the wardrobe with clenched fists when suddenly Diana ran and placed herself between it and him.

"Let me come at him," cried the Professor hoarsely. "He's in there; I know he is; I heard him."

"Yes, he is in here," replied Diana, her eyes flashing, as she stood like some beautiful creature at bay, "but I am sure it would be best for you and me and all of us, if you went quietly away and left him. What is done, 'is done.'"

Far from pacifying him, these remarks only threw the Professor into a still greater fury. "The loathsome reptile," he ejaculated most unzoologically, "I'll wring his neck like a rat."

So saying, he pushed Diana roughly out of the way, and tried to open the door of the wardrobe, only to find that it was locked.

"Give me the key," said the Professor hoarsely. After a brief struggle he snatched it from her and went towards the

wardrobe once more. Diana stood looking on in horror, wringing her hands, and crying out, "Don't hurt him John, please! Don't hurt him! Do anything you like to *me*, only let him go."

The Professor's hands trembled so much with rage and excitement that he could hardly fit the key into the lock. But he managed it at last. Then, roughly, he flung open the door, and there in front of him—in a basket—with a bow of blue ribbon round its neck, was a beautiful Persian cat. It stared steadily up at him with wide opened eyes that shone like opals in the glare of the electric light.

"There's Dr. Perkins, dear," said Diana—her voice had suddenly assumed its normal tone—"isn't he sweet?"

The Professor gazed down stupidly into the solemn eyes of the cat.

The voice of Diana broke in upon his dazed reverie. "Aren't you even going to say 'good evening' to him, John?"

By this time the cat had come out from its hiding-place, and was walking sedately to and fro with its tail up, rubbing its head and side against the Professor's legs.

"Well, he seems to remember *you* all right," said Diana cheerfully, "even if you don't remember him."

Professor Grantham was still very angry. "I want to know what the devil all this means, Diana; and I want to know where Perkins is."

"Why, John, I told you, he is there at your feet. You are really more forgetful than usual to-night. Don't you remember the evening, about three months ago, when the children brought a stray kitten into the drawing-room. This is the very same one—isn't it, my ducky? [this to the cat which was now in her arms]—the very same Dr. Perkins—'Perk' for short, Perk the 'Norfun.'"

A light began to break through the confusion of the Professor's thoughts, but it was the light of a red and angry dawn. Like Nick Bottom he began to perceive that he had been made an ass. He produced the letter once more from his pocket.

"I don't quite understand. You say you wrote this?"

"I did," replied Diana briskly, "and another one too, about a week ago, 'from an old friend.'"

"The deuce you did! That too? What devil possessed you to do that, if I may ask?" said the Professor with a sneer.

"No devil," replied Diana cheerfully, "I did it for a bit of fun. I thought it would liven things up a bit."

"Oh, did you? You've got a remarkably queer sense of humour. I think it was a dirty, shabby trick to play on a fellow. You can't imagine what I've suffered this evening. I would not have believed you could have done such a rotten thing."

"But, John, I couldn't help it," Diana retorted stubbornly.

"*Couldn't help it?*" he ejaculated, his voice rising almost to a shriek.

"Of course not. You know quite well I couldn't help it. I couldn't *possibly, really, truly, scientifically and philosophically* help it."

"What on earth do you mean?" answered the Professor, beginning to think that Diana was losing her wits.

Diana drew herself up to her full height and struck a friends - Romans - and - countrymen - lend - me - your - ears attitude, and went on in a declamatory voice: "No, friends, I couldn't help it; no one can help anything. '*We are all the sport of external circumstances*'—it was well said—'*We think we are free agents, but this feeling is only one of our many illusions. There is no doubt whatever that, if we were in the possession of all the data we should be able to predict with infallible certainty what any single (or married!) person would be doing at any given date in the future, down to the smallest details,*' such as spending the night in a London hotel with Dr. Perkins. Nor can I help *doing this,*' she added, as she suddenly rushed up to him, put her arms round his neck and kissed him many times, to his increased astonishment.

While this oration had been going on electric sparks of thought flashed here and there, in luminous trails, about the grey matter of the Professor's brain—linking up this unconnected incident with that—until the general outline of Diana's Machiavellian plan lay before him.

So she had been playing a game with him all along, the cunning little villain. Confound these women! you never know where you have them! Still waters run so deep. But anyway, thank goodness there was nothing in that Perkins business after all—*that* was something to be thankful for. Yet nevertheless it was an abominably shabby trick to play on a fellow, and she should be made to smart for it. He must let her know how angry he was.



Meanwhile Diana was looking up at him with a smiling face, her clear blue eyes sparkling with mischief like a naughty puppy. But the Professor hardened his heart and began to upbraid Diana for her inexcusable and scandalous behaviour.

"Go on, John dear," she answered meekly, "I am like Brother Juniper. I like to be scolded. The more you blame me, the more complete is my victory. Don't you see, the more it is *my* fault, the less is it the fault of *that beastly old 'external environment'* that you are always talking about—the more in fact it is '*my will, not all the world.*' So take a long breath, dear, and begin all over again."

But the Professor did not begin again. He seemed to be bound hand and foot in the web of Diana's argument. The more he struggled the more completely he made himself a prisoner—like a fly in a spider's web.

Diana watched him narrowly, not now with a flaunting look of triumph, but rather with the anxiety of a doctor who has just performed a serious operation and wonders how it is going to turn out.

Her surgery had cut deep. It was, however, to prove successful; for, beneath the crust of his professional dignity, and in spite of his scientific scepticism, the real John Grantham was an honest, simple, lovable human being.

He went towards Diana, and putting his hands on her shoulders, held her at arms length for a while. "You little minx," he said at length very slowly; and then, quite suddenly, he drew her to him and kissed her more passionately than he had done for years.

At last, letting her go, he began to laugh. Diana had never heard him laugh like that before—at least not for years and years. He sank back in an armchair and laughed till the tears ran down his face. A strange and almost indescribable sensation of levity had come over him—almost of physical levity. He felt like a man who has been suddenly relieved of a heavy weight that he has been carrying for a long time. He felt so light that he would have hardly been surprised if he had risen up and floated out through the window.

It was not merely that he was sport enough to see and enjoy a joke against himself that made the Professor so hilarious. It was partly due to an almost hysterical reaction after the agonized tension of the last six hours. But most of all

it was because it seemed to him that, in this faultless argument of Diana's, he had caught a glimpse of some tremendous cosmic joke. It was as though one of the Archangels had uttered some stupendous bon mot which had set all the stars winking, the winds roaring and the waves rocking to and fro in uncontrollable gaiety and laughter.

When his mirth had subsided Diana sat down on his knees and put her arm round his neck.

"Well, John," she said, "have I won my bet?"

"What bet, my precious philosopher?"

"You don't really mean to say you have forgotten that too! I sometimes think, John, you must be getting softening of the brain."

"I've had softening of the heart to-night, my dear, or I should have run you into jail for the things you've done this day . . . however, go on."

"Well, don't you remember that night the *two* Dr. Perkins came, you promised me that, if I could make you believe that I had acted like a 'bus' and not a 'tram,' you would get me a little bus of my own."

"Ah! so that's the way the land lies, is it?" said the Professor half to himself, as this new revelation dawned on him—"wheels within wheels!"

"Don't interrupt," said Diana, "we are coming to the crucial point. Do you or do you not seriously and honestly think that in coming here to-night I was determined simply and solely by my 'external environment.'"

"Emphatically, I do not," answered the Professor. "I am confident that you behaved in a most despicable and culpable manner."

"Hurrah!" said Diana, "I'm so glad you think so, for now you will have to give me my 'bus.'"

"Yes, you shall have your bus," said the Professor thoughtfully, "and we'll go and choose it to-morrow."

"Oh, John, you *are* a dear," said Diana, hugging him tight and giving him another kiss.

"And I think my discovery has been cheap at the price," remarked the Professor, half to himself.

"What discovery, John?"

"That man is a free agent—and woman too," he added significantly. "Nevertheless, my love, I shall always maintain that you are a very *determined* woman."

E. MORTIMER STANDING.

# MISCELLANEA

## I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

### A SPEECH BY LORD HALIFAX.<sup>1</sup>

WITH COMMENTS BY FATHER WOODLOCK, S.J.

<sup>1</sup>*Lord Halifax has been for many years the venerated lay leader of the extreme "Anglo-Catholic" party in the Anglican Church. It was he who arranged for the "Malines Conversations" between "Anglo-Catholics" and some French ecclesiastics under the presidency of Cardinal Mercier. He delivered this speech at the annual "Anglo-Catholic" Congress in London on July 9, 1925, at the Albert Hall, London, before an audience of about 10,000 people. The speech was fully reported in The Times and other papers. Only a small proportion of his audience seemed disposed to accept the Papal claim to universal jurisdiction over the whole Church, and a still smaller proportion, if indeed any, would accept Papal infallibility as defined by the Vatican Council. Most Anglicans would give a "primacy of honour" jure ecclesiastico to the Pope, but not "supremacy" jure divino. Lord Halifax said:*

**"T**HE great question which confronts all Christian men and women to-day in face of the unbelief surrounding us on every side, is how, without sacrifice of truth,<sup>2</sup> we may hope to restore the broken unity of Christendom."

<sup>2</sup>*"Without sacrifice of truth." We are all agreed that external union without internal agreement in faith is not worth having nor could a compromise on defined dogma be accepted as a basis of union with the Catholic Church.*

"A solemn obligation rests upon each one of us in regard to this matter. We cannot hold aloof, nor can we look on with cold indifference at the efforts being made, few and feeble though they may be, to arrive at a better understanding of the causes which separate us from our fellow-Christians.

How indeed is it possible for those who share the belief in the Incarnation, Resurrection and Ascension of our dear Lord, and whose souls are nourished with His most precious Body and Blood, to be content to pass their earthly lives in a state of spiritual estrangement from each other, in direct opposition to His Divine Will?

I have myself for many years past been associated with that branch of the subject which specially concerns the relations existing between ourselves and the Church of Rome, having al-

ways felt that any steps which led to a reconciliation between us and Rome could not fail in having a profound influence upon the whole question of Christian reunion.

And here, to prevent all possible misconception, let me say at once that I am only speaking for myself. I in no way represent the opinions of those with whom I have been to Malines. I certainly do not express the opinions of Bishop Gore; what the Bishop of Truro and Dr. Kidd may think I do not know. I am sure the Archbishop of Canterbury would dissent from my words and the interpretation which might be put upon them. But the Archbishop has been goodness itself and generosity itself in regard to me and nothing would cause me greater distress than to think I had exposed him to misconception by anything I had said. Hence this disavowal."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup>*Though only speaking for himself, yet his words bear weight as those of the organizer of the Malines Conversations who attended all its meetings and heard the views of the Catholic theologians who met there. His words may easily have been taken by lay members of the vast audience who heard them and the still vaster multitude who read the reports of the speech in the press, as a quasi-official expression of the terms of agreement that might be offered to Anglicans in case of a corporate union with Rome. The minutes of the "Conversations" have not yet been published, and so people will judge by such utterances as that of Lord Halifax in the Albert Hall, and will be likely to conclude that he expressed Cardinal Mercier's views. This, most emphatically, is not so. Some important statements of Lord Halifax would certainly be denied by the Cardinal.*

"I do not think however that I am bound on this account to conceal my own opinions or to hide convictions vitally affecting the whole cause of reunion, which, though they may not be accepted to-day, will assuredly be generally accepted to-morrow."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup>*Thus the speaker puts forward what he believes to be the future condition of the Anglican Church, united corporately with the Catholic Church as a "Uniate" Church, and having the privileges which are conceded to "Uniates" in the East.*

"To proceed, I have said that I have always felt that any steps which led to a reconciliation between us and Rome could not fail in having a profound influence upon the whole question of Christian reunion.

It was therefore with peculiar pleasure that I observed a reference to the 'Malines Conversations' in the Whitsun pastoral of Mgr. Chollet, Archbishop of Cambrai, in which he says: 'They have brought men's hearts nearer together and have stimulated thought and dissipated misunderstanding.'"<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup>*"dissipated misunderstanding." So far they seem to have created a grave misunderstanding, if Lord Halifax's speech be*

*taken as a sample, and still more so if it be regarded as authoritatively representing Catholic theology.*

"Let me also read to you a short extract from a letter which I recently received from that great patriot and illustrious Churchman, Cardinal Mercier, Archbishop of Malines, wherein, referring to the subject which is so near his heart, he says: 'If Our Divine Saviour has willed the union of that Society of Souls of which He is the Head, ought we not all to say to ourselves that unity can be realized and that reunion can be secured? All therefore that remains for us is to discover by what road<sup>6</sup> we can attain to that union which is necessary for all in Christ.'"

*"to discover by what road." The road is clear; it is the road of submission to the supremacy and infallibility of the Pope and the acceptance of Leo XIII.'s decision with regard to the validity of Anglican Orders and the consequent use of the word "Church" when applied to the Anglican Establishment. This "road" we know already; it has not to be "discovered," except by Anglicans to whom we gladly point it out. The road is known to the Catholic theologians and it is regrettable that it was not unmistakably indicated to Lord Halifax. Real submission to the supremacy and infallibility of the Pope is the road.*

"Now in considering this aspect of the question of Reunion, it is well to bear in mind that for the space of a thousand years Rome and England were one.<sup>7</sup> Not was it the wish or intention of the best and wisest of our reformers<sup>8</sup> to sever the link which, for so many ages, had bound us to the Apostolic See, but only to reform certain abuses which, in the course of centuries, had crept into the Western Church."

*<sup>7</sup>It is true. Rome and England were one, in doctrine and in organized visible unity, and the English Church was then a "branch" or part of the Church Catholic. This is denied by most Anglicans, and many of their bishops have declared that England was never "Roman Catholic," but it is an obvious fact of history.*

*<sup>8</sup>History does not record the names of English Reformers who wished to conserve the link with Rome. Those Catholic bishops who were deprived of their sees and the martyrs who were hanged at Tyburn rather than renounce the Pope's supremacy are not numbered in history with the "reformers." Lord Halifax does them an injury in classing them with the men who brought about the change in religion, even though he would qualify his inclusion by saying they were the "best and wisest of the reformers."*

"Unfortunately the period of the Reformation in England preceded the sessions of the Great Council of Trent when many far-reaching reforms were carried out. And it is surely not

unreasonable to suppose that, had the reforming Council been held at an earlier epoch, it might, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, have altered the whole course of Church history.

In regard to our relations with Rome it is necessary for us to remember that the authority of the Pope (according to Roman teaching) is not an authority separate from that of the episcopate, but, when acting in full unison with the episcopate, he is to be regarded as the centre and symbol<sup>9</sup> of unity, invested in virtue of his office, with Apostolic authority over, and solicitude for, the visible Church throughout the world."

<sup>9</sup>The "centre and symbol,"—these are vague words. He is also the source of unity in God's plan. The Pope is in no sense the "source" of Catholic unity in the minds of Anglicans. They deny that part of the Vatican definition which declares the Pope's infallibility to be "apart from the consent of the Church." "Anglo-Catholics" would regard the Pope as merely a sort of President, or Chairman or "Speaker" of a Council. If he were to make a definition apart from a General Council, Anglicans declare that we should have to wait and see if his definition were accepted by the whole Church before we could know if it were true. Thus, Peter does not "confirm" but is confirmed by his brethren; the "rock" foundation does not give support and stability to the House of God but the rock rests on the roof and gets its own stability from the building (the acceptance of the Church). Thus does "Anglo-Catholic" theology understand Papal infallibility, inverting the instituted order of Christ, the "Master Builder" of the Church! The Pope is bound to use every means of finding out the "mind of the Church," but the infallibility of his utterance does not depend on his diligence in this study. It is a thing apart, and is due to the "assistance" of the Holy Spirit protecting his dogmatic definition from error.

"It is well, therefore, to remind you that, though it may be difficult, if not impossible,<sup>10</sup> to arrive at a rigorous delimitation of the respective rights *jure divino* of the Pope on the one side and of the Episcopate on the other, reunion between ourselves and Rome is unattainable unless we are prepared to concede a primacy *divina Providentia* as appertaining to the Holy See, and to admit the claim of the Pope to occupy a position in relation to the whole episcopate, such as no other bishop can lay claim to. This is a matter which must be faced by us, with all its implications.

<sup>10</sup>Note that Lord Halifax declares that it may be impossible to define the authority of the Pope in regard to the episcopate. Also note the vagueness of the phrase "*divina providentia*." Pope Pius XI. is "*divina providentia*" the present Pope, but that does not mean a supernatural "assistance" given to the Cardinals who chose him. The phrase *jure divino* should be



used of the supremacy, to make it clear that it is an inalienable prerogative and part of the Church's divinely planned constitution. "*Divina providentia*" may be well used of the patriarchates though they are constituted *jure ecclesiastico*. The Church would still be the same, did they cease to exist.

"Let us now briefly consider some of the results which might follow complete reunion between the Anglican Church and the See of Rome."<sup>11</sup>

<sup>11</sup>He here sketches a uniate Church. The audience will legitimately deduce that these concessions would be made, the authority of the speaker and his conversations at Malines will lend weight to these concessions as having possibly been promised in the event of "corporate reunion." These "uniates" privileges have hitherto only been granted to "Churches" in the stricter sense of sects who possess a valid episcopate. This is not admitted by Rome of the Establishment.

"In the first place, there is no need to apprehend undue interference with the peculiar status and prerogatives of the See of Canterbury, nor with the Government of the Church as now administered throughout this realm."<sup>12</sup>

<sup>12</sup>"The government of the Church, as now administered throughout this realm." But the Bishops are appointed by the Government Prime Minister, who often is not a member of the Church! And "Anglo-Catholics" themselves complain that most of the Bishops are to-day heretics as a result of this form of Church Government.

"Nor have we the slightest reason to fear that we should be deprived of our national liturgy,<sup>13</sup> which has come down to us through the centuries, hallowed by the devotions of generations of English Church-people."

<sup>13</sup>The "National Liturgy" was composed by the reformers to supplant the Catholic Missal. Many Anglicans would agree that this liturgy was created to get rid of the Sacrifice of the Mass as taught in the Catholic Church and to exclude the idea of a propitiatory sacrifice. "Come down through the centuries" can only refer to the last 350 years. There is little likelihood of a Prayer Book Revision resulting in a liturgy which would be acceptable to "Rome." It will necessarily express by its vagueness the doctrinal comprehensiveness of the "Three-Party" Establishment.

"Nor should we be called upon to surrender our matchless translation of the Holy Scriptures, which has had so large a share in moulding our language and inspiring our literature and which may be said to have entered into the very fibre of our national character.

For it must be remembered that reconciliation with Rome does not imply any denial of the historic claims of Canterbury, nor

involve the absorption of the Church of England into the Church of Rome, but rather the union of the two Churches under the primacy of the successor of St. Peter; which is quite another thing."<sup>14</sup>

<sup>14</sup>*Here we come to the greatest and most harmful misconception—the possibility of "reunion" without the denial of the "claims of Canterbury." Ask any Anglican to-day what are those claims, and he will reply: "To be to-day and to have been for the last 350 years a part or a 'branch' of the Catholic Church, and to have had Apostolic Succession and valid Orders during all the period of our separation from Rome." Anglicans, even if they accept the supremacy of the Pope, as does Lord Halifax, regard communion with the Successor of St. Peter as being merely of the bene esse and not of the esse of Catholicism. They believe that they are Catholics to-day before any union, and they believe in the "divisibility" of the Living Body of Christ, His Church. They are thus in error on a fundamental truth with regard to the nature of the Catholic Church, and they will have gathered from Lord Halifax's speech that they can be reconciled to the Pope "corporately" while still holding this false doctrine. It is this error which keeps Lord Halifax from entering the Catholic Church. He has pleaded for the acceptance of Papal Supremacy as a divinely given prerogative, but, as he believes himself to be a Catholic already while still an Anglican, he remains in the Established Church and wishes all Anglicans to do the same, working for "corporate reunion." This phrase itself contains false doctrine. There cannot be "reunion" between bodies that were never previously united. The Anglican Church began to exist only when some Catholics apostatized under Edward and Elizabeth, and were intruded by the State into the place and possessions of the old religion, just as America began to exist as a new nation when it drove out the rulers that represented England. There is a material continuity in the possession of Churches that were Catholic and bishops bearing the old names of Catholic Sees, but these things no more prove formal continuity than does the English language and descent prove Americans to be Englishmen to-day.*

*I have now, I hope, written enough for my purpose, although I have not by any means exhausted the criticisms that might be made on the speech which reaches a touching finale thus—*

*"On the other hand, I beg you to consider what an immeasurable gain it would be to the Church of England in carrying her warfare on behalf of Catholic truth against the forces of unbelief—not in this small island alone, but in every corner of the world where Anglican and Roman missions meet together—if she were once more in full communion with the greatest and most potent of Christian Churches; what added strength would*

be given her: what hidden springs of grace would be revealed!

Let me then, in conclusion, leave this thought in your minds. You cannot undertake a nobler or more inspiring task on behalf of your Lord and Saviour than that of helping to bind up the wounds of Christendom, so that God's faithful people may be once more knit together in one Communion and fellowship. Not by surrendering one fragment of the "faith" once delivered to the Saints, but by humble submission to the guidance of God the Holy Spirit, Who in His appointed time "shall lead you into all truth." By so doing you will earn for yourselves—

God's benison on those  
Who would make right the wrong  
And friends of foes.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>15</sup>*The advantages of uniting all Christian forces against infidelity are acknowledged by all Christians, only they cannot be won by compromise of truth. In Lord Halifax's final exhortation we can all most heartily concur.*

*In conclusion, I should wish to have been spared the task of criticizing one who is full of zeal to bring about the return of the English people to union with the rest of Christendom in the Catholic Church. But loyalty to that Church, and my fear that the misunderstanding which exists with regard to the position of the Pope will only be increased by Lord Halifax's well-intentioned speech, have compelled me to write the above comments on words which have been broadcast far beyond the Albert Hall audience and which may help to keep many from submitting individually to the Divinely appointed Head of the One Undivided and Indivisible Church of Christ.*

F.W.

#### A LAST WORD ON "MALINES."

A REPORT printed in *The Universe* for June 12th that Cardinal Mercier had admitted to certain Milan journalists the failure of the "Malines Conferences" will have been read with relief by those who knew from the first that such Conferences could never have been even inaugurated save through the influence of a mutual misapprehension. The Catholics concerned did not realize the true nature of Anglicanism, nor did the Anglicans understand the true nature of Catholicism. Whether the Catholics are now better informed, we cannot say: but the Cardinal's admission gives us hope. That the Anglicans unhappily are not, we have many indications: in their regard, the Conferences seem to have been practically useless. They have learnt nothing they might not have learnt in any presbytery parlour: they have not even learnt that. Why should they, as intelligent men, have approached Cardinal Mercier, unless they thought that

he had something new to tell them about the Church's view of their position? Necessarily disappointed in that respect, they might at least have learnt the old doctrine. But even now, after these four discussions, none of them seems to have realized that the Catholic Church cannot accept any ecclesiastical body, separate from herself, as belonging to the Church of Christ. The schismatic Churches of the East she regards as dead branches severed from the Vine, although through God's mercy still mediating grace to *bona fide* believers by means of their valid Sacraments. But the other so-called Churches have never, in her view, been attached to the Vine at all, and thus are not even dead branches. Owing to the universality of the baptismal rite, their members, if validly baptized and not consciously in heresy or grievous sin, are reckoned as belonging, according to the common metaphor, to the Soul of the Church, but do not participate in her corporate privileges. Catholic doctrine holds that to this second class belongs the Anglican Church, set up by the State at the Reformation alongside the true Catholic Church, and therefore possessing in the eyes of "Rome" no standing as a Church at all, any more than do the Methodists or the Society of Friends.

This is a mere statement of fact, based on the constant tradition of the Church, not therefore to be changed without loss of her identity as the unique Body founded by Christ, the guardian and exponent of His revelation, the continued abode of His Spirit. There is no arrogance in the claim: the Church must be what Christ made her. To ask her to alter her attitude, to reverse her teaching and tradition, is to ask her to tear up her title deeds, and, in a very literal sense, to deny the faith once delivered to the Saints. The non-Catholic world may dispute the claim, but it has no right to ignore it. Yet this is what an educated man like Bishop Welldon, the Dean of Durham, recently did, although in the course of a long life of controversy he must have had the Church's standpoint put before him times out of mind. He complained in a letter to *The Times*<sup>1</sup> of "the spirit in which the Church of Rome approaches the question of Christian reunion," and goes on to say "there must, I think, be some recognition of equality between the two parties to a conference, or it can only end in failure." Why should this learned man, at this period of history, feel aggrieved that the Catholic Church shows herself to be, what she always has been, conscious of the divine charge given her to preserve the faith intact? Why should he ignore her essential characteristic, and expect her to give the lie to her past? It is this refusal to face the facts, this desire for compromise on every question, that introduces such confusion into Anglican controversy. Our opponents will

<sup>1</sup> May 22nd.

not keep in mind that the institution they deal with claims to be divine, and has no power to alter the revelation committed to her any more than she can change the moral law.

Was this fact, we may respectfully enquire, pressed home courteously yet firmly to the Anglican disputants in the recent Conferences? If so, why did Cardinal Mercier, in his very letter commending the last Conference to the prayers of his flock, use the unfortunate phrase *réunion des églises*, which seems to imply a belief that his Anglican guests represented what was truly a Church, formerly united with "Rome," and therefore capable of being reunited? And, if so, where has the Abbé Portal, one of his assessors, retracted his preposterous description of the English Church as "a daughter of Rome," a member of "the Patriarchate of the West"?<sup>1</sup> We can only surmise, from the result, either that this fundamental fact—the Unicity and necessarily visible Unity of the Church of Christ—was not put, as it ought to have been, in the forefront of the Conference, or that Anglican prejudices prevented its being understood. For the result has shown that one at least of the Anglicans went away, still hoping that "Rome would meet them halfway." What *could* he have been told?

It is true that no authoritative account of the proceedings has yet been published. On the other hand, the venerated Lord Halifax, a well-loved leader of the "Anglo-Catholic" party and the "father" of the Conferences, delivered a speech at their Annual Rally which clearly showed, not only that he had not altered his views, but that he thought "Rome" had, or at least could. We are glad to be able to publish this speech above, with some reflections by Father Woodlock. Meanwhile we may note that Lord Halifax has left Malines without learning that the Church is Visibly One, and still believing in the Continuity theory, that hoary historical fallacy which generations of Catholic writers have exploded, which the Elizabethans, killing, racking and plundering the adherents of "the old religion," never dreamt of, to which the existing Catholic Church in this country, heir to the faith, if not to the possessions, of the martyrs, daily gives the lie. The speaker said truly enough that for 1,000 years the Church in England was closely united with the Holy See, but he implied that, at the Reformation, that filial bond was severed. In loyalty to our glorious dead, as well as to the truth for which they died, we must protest against that false implication and, in so far as it seems to be endorsed by our brethren abroad, we must make bold to deny the competence of foreigners to understand our intimate history better than ourselves.<sup>2</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> v. *Revue des Sciences Religieuses*, October, 1923.

<sup>2</sup> We note with a certain surprise that a contributor to the current issue of *Pax* is allowed to make an uncalled-for suggestion that Catholics in England fail in sympathy and understanding towards Anglicans, and to repeat a statement

Church in England has never been separated from "Rome,"<sup>1</sup> and we owe her glorious survival to the perspicacity with which our blessed martyrs and confessors detected the appearance and approach of heresy, while so many fell away, and the generosity with which they shed their blood or gave their substance in defence of the changeless faith of Peter. The Catholic Church in England, albeit mangled and almost done to death, outlasted and finally triumphed over both the Tudor tyranny and the succeeding centuries of State persecution, in spite of "the cuckoo in the nest," that Erastian establishment whereby Edward and Elizabeth sought to supplant it, and it draws its vigour to-day, the clearness of its witness to truth, its devotion to the See of Peter, from the steadfast loyalty to faith shown by that gallant remnant in the fiery day of trial.

The whole of Lord Halifax's speech, as Father Woodlock's analysis shows, is based therefore on a fundamental misconception, so obvious and so elementary that one wonders how it was passed over during those long sessions at Malines, four times repeated, concerning the Catholic faith. His ideal is a Uniate Church, while "Rome" sees no Church at all. He champions the historic rights of the See of Canterbury, whilst in the eyes of "Rome," no such See canonically exists. He ignores wholly the Anglican Modernists who have practically abandoned institutional Christianity altogether: he ignores the Anglican Evangelicals, who are as devoted to the anti-sacramental, anti-Roman Elizabethan tradition as ever those were that did Papists to death for hearing Mass: he ignores the Anglican Indifferentists, who frequent no Church at all, but belong to various golf-clubs. And he ignores, more thoroughly than all else, the most outstanding and essential claim of the Church with which he would deal, a claim so unique, so searching, so overwhelming, that, once admitted, hesitation becomes sinful and bargaining preposterous: a claim so supra-human that no institution not divine could make it without blasphemy. Lord Halifax is still blind to the City set upon a Hill, and that indeed gives the measure of the failure of Malines. He imagines that he is alone in a temerarious advance, outstripping his tardy colleagues; where-

attributed to an unnamed Cardinal in Rome that in this regard we "lack the amplitude and tolerance of the Roman mind." We venture to think that Rome understands the attitude towards Anglicans of Catholics in England better than such an unsubstantiated report would imply.

If, as some maintain, on the principle "no Bishop, no Church," the old Catholic Church was extinguished in England with the extinction of the ancient hierarchy, the Anglican case is no better. The Catholic faithful in England still remained under Papal care and jurisdiction, ministered to by priests commissioned by the Pope, whilst the Elizabethan establishment took its rise from the passing of the Acts of Parliament which repudiated Papal Supremacy and abolished the Mass, and, being without a valid Episcopate, never became a Church at all.



as, in reality, he is with them still. He and the other Anglicans quitted Malines substantially as they came, no nearer to surmounting what one of their number, Bishop Gore, calls "those enormous dogmatic obstacles which 'Rome' has interposed between us and them." To what purpose, then, these Conferences, which cannot teach even the Catechism? Only the final and definite recognition by these earnest and well-meaning men that there is no way into the Fold, represented by the Church Catholic and Roman, except by a Gate one has to stoop to pass through, can free them from the brand of utter failure.

J.K.

---

## II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

### **The Progress of European Peace.**

It is something, considering the difficulties which diplomacy has to deal with, to be able to say that the Western Peace Pact, the first international attempt since the war to get rid of the war-mind, has survived a month's attack by the jingoes of Press and Parliament, and has in fact advanced several steps towards acceptance. It is a sign that common sense is beginning to return to war-fevered minds, and that even politicians now realize that to pursue selfish national aims without regard to the interests or rights of others is the shortest way to failure. The commercial depression which lies like a pall over the land is the direct result of the destruction of the foreigner's capacity or the foreigner's will to trade with us. All the punitive policies indulged in since the war have recoiled upon the victors' heads: every year that reconciliation was postponed has made recovery more difficult. And now that Pope Benedict's advice to condone and forgive and show mercy is at last seen to be the only sensible plan, it will still need strenuous and persistent efforts on the part of the peace-makers to prevent the resurgence of fear and mistrust between the nations. The Allies must remember that a gesture of reconciliation loses much more than half its value if it is half-hearted. Germany is hampered by more than her share of jingoes, thirsting for revenge and anxious to embark again on the old insensate paths of militarism. Allowance should be made for the difficulties which the Republican Government feels in maintaining a friendly policy in spite of the monarchists, and above all, the way should be made as smooth as possible for Germany to enter the League of Nations, and take her seat in the Council. The fact that the Soviet Government is strongly opposed to her doing so is almost in itself reason enough to hasten the event, for peace in Europe

is the last thing desired by the Bolshevik. Germany's promise not to invoke force as a means of rectifying her eastern frontiers, implies no doubt that she will employ negotiation. Even if she does she will be acting in accordance with the spirit of the League, which expressly provides for modifications of Treaty arrangements which seem to require modification.

**Germany  
and  
the League of  
Nations.**

Once within the League, Germany can use her influence to bring about that universal reduction of armaments of which her own disarmament was intended to be both the model and the motive. And if the Allies are slow to follow the example which they themselves have proposed to themselves, their delay will inevitably suggest that they were not sincere in insisting on Germany's disarmament. The economic crisis in which the Old World finds itself makes superfluous expenditure in armaments more injurious to public welfare than ever. In this country a tithe of the sum spent on national defence would enable the Government to help the coal-industry over the dead period that afflicts it. It would be absurd for the man-in-the-street—which is our point of view—to decide magisterially that such and such expenditure is not needed, that we have enough cruisers for instance, or need not increase our air-force. But the man-in-the-street, submitting to the expert's plea of necessity, has a right to demand that Government should strive to remove the necessity, should, by reiterated Conferences and constant suggestions, emphasize the wisdom of a mutual and progressive scaling down of the immense machinery for aggression and defence which has remained or grown up since the war.

**Unnecessary  
Naval  
Expenditure?**

It is a sign that the dire need of economy is being more and more felt by those responsible for public affairs that a Government, which in normal times would have gladly followed all the Admiralty's suggestions, and added freely to our naval strength, should have shown itself reluctant to find the requisite monies even for cruiser-replacement and have reduced its programme considerably. Yet the man-in-the-street may still wonder how the need of more warships can be so great. Cruisers are wanted to protect British trade routes: not in peace time, for there are no pirates nowadays. Therefore only in war. From what naval Power would British trade need protection. The only Power with which war is conceivable and which has a navy capable of aggression is Japan. Japan could certainly damage unprotected British commerce in the East, but who is to injure it on this side of the globe? And could not a pooling of British and American resources safeguard it in the East as

well? It has, perhaps, been unheard of in the world's history hitherto, that a nation should rely upon a friendly State for protection of its nationals, but such mutual assistance should be a feature of the changed international mentality caused by the world-war. At any rate, when the alternative is crushing taxation and the starving of many measures for civic betterment, the man-in-the-street may suggest that it should be given a trial.

**The Fight  
against  
Race-Suicide.**

The victory gained by Dr. Halliday Sutherland in the Court of Final Appeal over a prominent advocate of Birth Control has by no means put an end to that deplorable propaganda, and it behoves all those who have the moral welfare of the country at heart to combine their strength in order to oppose it effectually. Dr. Sutherland has done yeoman service in the matter, and his new book, "Birth Control Exposed,"<sup>1</sup> which meets and overthrows its misguided adherents on their own ground, will remain one of the moralist's most effective weapons, but it would be manifestly unfair to leave this fight for righteousness, which is only beginning, in the hands of one man, however able, and the whole of our Catholic forces, with, we trust, the adhesion of all who believe in the Christian tradition, must combine to move public opinion, and the legislation dependent on it, against the teaching of a practice, which degrades man and woman alike to the level of the beast and has such serious social consequences. *The Saturday Review*, which, one had hoped, would have been better advised, prints (July 25th) an appeal for funds from the Constructive Birth Control Society wherein is indicated how the plague is being spread amongst the poor. Hitherto, both under the present and the Labour Governments, the Ministry of Health has rightly set its face against the use of public money, in State- and Rate-aided institutions, to teach this evil practice, but in view of further attempts to influence the Government the Christian protest must make itself loudly and persistently heard. That tuition in wickedness of this sort, by private individuals at their own cost, should be permitted by the police is bad enough, but that the money of decent-thinking and decent-living citizens should be so misused would be a monstrous injustice. We are glad that the Catholic Confederation are bestirring themselves in the matter and we trust that every parish in the land will support them. And we may reasonably hope that societies like the great Anglican "Mothers' Union," which has done such good work in opposing divorce, will lend a hand at putting down this other crime against the marriage-state as well.

<sup>1</sup> Cecil Palmer. v. The July MONTH, p. 93.

**The  
Over-Population  
Bogey.**

Connected with this question, and indeed used by Birth-Controllers as one of their stock arguments, is the alleged danger of nations becoming over-populated. In Japan the population increases by some 700,000 yearly, whilst in Italy the yearly increase of 500,000 has caused a writer in the *Idea Nazionale* to break out into undisguised Prussianism:

We shall in a few years be menaced by a formidable crisis of unemployment and misery, which may have the greatest possible consequences socially and politically, not only for Italy, but for the whole of Europe . . . if we do not want to perish we shall be obliged to take what we need. . . . The present political map of the Mediterranean must be altered. And this change can be brought about only by an act of force.<sup>1</sup>

The writer is obviously a victim to the old Malthusian hallucination, the night-mare of an over-populated world, outgrowing the means of subsistence. Italy, he thinks, in such a case would have no choice but to alter the map of the Mediterranean, *i.e.*, seize by force the land of her neighbours, driven to this desperate course by the pressure on her soil. This immoral nonsense is being preached everywhere, so that public opinion may be prepared for a legal restriction of births. The Malthusians pass easily from a possibility to a probability, and from a probability to an actuality. Owing to the commercial oneness of the world, no country is dependent on its own soil for support: the human family lives on the produce of the family estate—the earth, the resources of which have hardly begun to be realized. Huge empty spaces in the New World are calling for settlers. Even Japan has large uncultivated tracts. There are difficulties in some countries about immigration, as in the United States, but already the quota-restrictions there are beginning to cause economic trouble as the supply of industrious workers falls off. In any case, it is not for this generation, or for this century even, to worry about over-population: let us rather deal justly and reasonably with such population as we have. The conclusion of *The Times* leader cited above—"But, while their [the Italians'] fertility seems ever to increase, the empty spaces of the globe are rapidly diminishing"—is not borne out by fact. The growth is very gradual, and there are many set-backs. Africa, S. America, Mexico, Babylonia, and other parts of the globe, were once the seats of teeming populations which have left no successors. The believer is willing to leave to Providence the care of His own creation.

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in *The Times*, July 25th.

**Work for  
Peace  
in Germany.**

Governments can make war, but only the peoples can make peace, the peoples who are rendered vocal mainly through the press, but also through congresses, national and international, through trade negotiations and every other form of intercourse. The future peace of the world depends largely on a conscientious press, which does its best to promote good will between various nations and tries to make its readers understand the foreign point of view. We trust, therefore, that many papers will follow the example of the great organ of the German Centre Party, *Germania*, which has lately devoted a certain portion of its Saturday issue to articles and discussions about Franco-German relations, written not only by Germans, but also by Frenchmen, Englishmen and "neutrals." The various points of view are stated with perfect frankness, yet with a desire to see what is reasonable in an opponent's argument and with a steady regard for the higher interests which are common to all. *Germania* has long laboured for this understanding of mind and heart between two great nations.

It seems absurd [the editor wrote over two years ago] that at a time when international intercourse is easier and more constant than ever, two peoples of high civilization, two neighbouring peoples like France and Germany, should know each other so little and so badly. Yet for the peace of Europe, for the salvation of the West, there is no other means than that they should learn to know one another and try to understand one another.<sup>1</sup>

And during the time immediately preceding the last elections the paper wrote: "Whatever may be, under the chance influences of the moment, the actual composition of the Parliaments and Governments of Germany, the immense majority of the German people have no desire to hear mentioned a policy of revenge or of conquest." And, finally, after speaking of the spontaneous cheers which greeted any allusion to Franco-German friendship at German political meetings, *Germania* adds: "The Centre Party, at all events, a factor of peculiar importance, is unanimous in its endeavours to arrive at a final accord with France." The *Temps* acclaimed this as an "Article sensationnel," but it seems to have excited little attention elsewhere. Every bellicose utterance of the nationalists is re-echoed in our press, but the quieter voice of peace is not so readily broadcast.

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in *Bulletin Catholique International*, August, 1925.

**I. K. A.  
at Oxford.**

*Germania*, nevertheless, has pursued its Christian campaign. Intelligent and sympathetic German correspondents have visited France with the object of getting at the mind of the average man. Eminent Frenchmen have set forth their reasons for distrusting Germany, which resolve themselves into ignorance of her real motives,—another reason for frequent and intimate intercourse. Mr. Spender of the *Westminster Gazette* urges that no outside influence can make France and Germany friends: that must come from a mutual conviction of good will. And so the enterprise goes on, a happy beginning which can be wonderfully furthered and fostered by Catholic action in both countries, as well as in this. The Fifth Annual Conference of the "International Catholic League," known by the initials I.K.A., which meets presently at Oxford, will doubtless give a great stimulus to that friendly co-operation between individuals and societies of different nations from which the public desire and demand for international peace must spring. The meeting will also provide occasion for a discussion between the "International Catholic League" and the other similar bodies—"The International Office of Catholic Organizations," the "Catholic Union of International Studies," and our own "Catholic Council for International Relations," on the best means of bringing about the co-ordination of Catholic action, and so preventing loss of time, energy and money through overlapping activities. Peace, as we have often said, will be the crown and reward of prolonged effort of mind and will. The illusions and fallacies of centuries are not to be dissipated in a day, for they have become a mental habit with multitudes and are embodied in a vast unquestioned tradition. All this Catholic activity is meant to recall Catholics to the full implications of their faith. We are sometimes astonished to come across people, who are faultless Catholics in matters of belief and religious practice, but who are wholly pagan in their social and international outlook, having no more knowledge of how the Catholic profession should affect their relations towards their neighbour or towards foreigners than have the de-Christianized multitudes around them. The leaven in their case has not reached the whole mass.

**American  
Catholics and  
Peace.**

The United States, supreme in its own hemisphere, unassailable by land and easily protected by sea, prides itself upon being pre-eminently a peaceful nation. No one can accuse it of territorial ambition. The comparatively feeble States north and south, Canada and Mexico, do not raise a single additional man for their armies through fear of American aggression: their frontiers which march with the States are open



and undefended. No one, then, can doubt of the sincerity of America's love of peace and justice. But it seems to us that, sheltered from aggression as they are, and inheriting a stable peace tradition, Americans sometimes fail in sympathy with less favoured nations and do not do all that they might to spread their principles abroad. It is all very well to say to Europe—"Disband your armies, and then we will support your peace efforts." We need American help precisely to reduce our armies. We need especially the organized force of American Catholic opinion to help to create the will to peace amongst their fellow-Catholics in the Old World, to show, in fact, how essentially Catholic international justice and charity are. In common with the rest of their fellow-countrymen, or even in a markedly greater degree than they, American Catholics have, in the reaction from the Wilsonian policy, been indifferent to the various efforts made by war-menaced Europe to establish permanent peace amongst nations. They have not heeded the clear directions of Popes Benedict and Pius, they have nurtured a contempt for the League of Nations, they have looked coldly upon the Permanent Court of International Justice, they have not realized that hundreds of thousands of earnest men in the Old World, alive to the continued presence in their midst of the causes of war, are casting about for means to remove them. We have a sober arraignment of American Catholic apathy in a vigorous article in *The Salesianum* (Vol. XX., No. 2), by the well-known publicist, Dr. John A. Ryan, and the complaint is echoed in a very able paper by Mr. Carlton J. H. Hayes, published in our excellent contemporary, *The Commonwealth* for July 1st. These writings and others will, we trust, have their due effect, and perhaps we see the first fruits of them in the forthcoming visit from a delegate of the National Catholic Welfare Conference to the Oxford meeting. Peace, when it comes, will be the work of the Church Catholic, *i.e.*, of her children all over the world, inspired, guided and strengthened by her principles.

#### **The Coal Crisis.**

The I.K.A. Conference will be held jointly with the Sixth Annual Summer School of the Catholic Social Guild—an institution which was founded precisely to make Catholics Catholic all through, in regard to their business relations and their attitude towards commerce and industry,—more shortly, to Catholicize economics. It is because, now for generations, Christian morality has been given little say in such matters that we have come to the present woeful pass. Industrial history, especially since the peace, has recorded a series of quarrels between capital and labour, involving, during the past 32 years,

the average loss of 12,400,000 working days per annum,<sup>1</sup> and culminating in the present "coal" crisis, which will come to a head ere these words are published. It is typical of a long series of wrong-headed, unnecessary disputes. There have been conferences between miners and owners, and a Government enquiry, the net result of all which seems to be the recognition that the coal-industry as a whole cannot provide a living wage owing to foreign competition. There are over a million miners, of whom 300,000 are already out-of-work. A large number of mines are also out-of-work as wholly unproductive, and the number is increasing. Each side has so clear a case that it is generally recognized by the other. There seems no room for compromise. Some third party must needs intervene. The Government (*i.e.*, the taxpayer) might guarantee wages at the unprofitable mines, until the industry should be reorganized more economically. The domestic consumer might be asked similarly to pay more till the crisis is over. The transport services (the charges of which more than double the price of coal at the pit-head) might be content for a time with lower rates. The International Labour Office, the object of which is to prevent labour conditions from sinking to too low a level anywhere, might exert itself more vigorously to obtain the universal ratification of the 8-hour day, for it is partly the longer hours worked on the Continent that make it possible to under-cut British prices.<sup>2</sup> Finally more capital might be sunk in the mines to promote efficiency in working. The one thing that shouldn't be done is the thing which both sides are continually threatening—to stop working.

### **The Folly of Stopping Work.**

The universal strike which Labour has planned is so foolish a stroke of policy as to make one despair of human intelligence. For a stoppage of work means plunging the country as a whole still further into the slough of industrial depression, out of which all efforts should be made to rescue it. A strike of its own nature hits the poor who have no reserves much harder than the rich, and, although its severity is nowadays mitigated by unemployment benefit, still that fund is not inexhaustible. The same argument applies to the lock-out. Both policies are boomerangs which, besides spreading wide havoc amongst "neutrals," grievously injure those that adopt them: neither, in this case, can remedy in any way the state of things against which they are a protest. Mr. MacDonald, in a passage we quoted last year, and effectively repeated by the Premier at

<sup>1</sup> 8,320,000 days were lost last year. *Ministry of Labour Gazette*.

<sup>2</sup> Although the 8-hour day Convention was drafted at Washington as long ago as 1919, only five countries have so far ratified it. Germany, having to provide reparations by extra labour, has refused, naturally enough.

Knowsley on July 25th, repudiated the policy of bluff and bluster so thoughtlessly adopted. "I wish [he said] I could appeal to the interests of this nation to pursue methods in accordance with the moral categories. We are threatened with strikes and lock-outs, disputes and disturbances. How childish it all is, how foolish it all is!" And Mr. J. H. Thomas, speaking of the present crisis, said the other day:

Either a lock-out or a strike in the present state of our economic position would be absolutely disastrous to the future of the country, and God knows what the end of it would be. . . . I believe it is the bounden duty of all, who can contribute to some solution, to put their heads together and see what can be done.

On the other hand, how extremely foolish and childish was the remark of the President of the Miners' Federation on Sunday, July 25th: "I would rather fight and lose than not fight at all." That is the utterance of a narrow, unchristian, class-prejudice, blind even to its own true welfare.

**Capitalism  
on its  
Trial.**

Even in the interests of their own economic theory the Socialists amongst the miners should forbear from violent action. It is not needed, nay, it would weaken their argument.

Their case is greatly strengthened by the collapse of the industry. "Capitalism has been tried," they may say, "and found wanting: let us then have some other system." Capitalists can only answer—"We have failed because we are not regulated and organized. We have not made the best use of our resources. We can still make good if you give us time." And they could point to a declaration by Mr. Hodges, Secretary of the International Miners' Federation, on July 25th, in support of their plea. Mr. Hodges said that there was still a good living in the industry both for owners and men in the best areas, even at the present time. The problem is to prevent the unprofitable mines closing, to open again the 500 already closed, and absorb again the 300,000 unemployed. "This is possible," he went on, "even upon present wages and hours if the principles of the unification of the industry are applied on the one hand, and the so-called poor districts get an opportunity of disposing of their coal, not as raw fuel, but as power and bye-products," the Government lending practical help till this is accomplished. Whatever may be done, capitalists must remember that, if their system breaks down in this particular industry, some sort of substitute less regardful of the rights of property may be sought for.

**The Dayton  
Trial.**

The sudden death of Mr. W. J. Bryan has added a tragic note to the Tennessee anti-Darwinian trial, which the bulk of the press persisted in regarding as a farce. The conviction of the offending teacher was a foregone conclusion. No one denied that he had broken the law. But the issue was clouded by all sorts of irrelevant details. Both the Bible and the Darwinian theory were put on trial, and the pleadings were simply for or against Evolution. It seemed as if the Judge, once the press had brought such a spot-light upon Dayton, had not the heart to deprive the crowd of their expected excitement by ruling out these improper issues. The verdict confined itself to a simple breach of contract, which was admitted, and it is difficult to see on what grounds an appeal can be lodged. Unless the law itself is unsound, the violation of which formed the grounds of conviction, no exception can be taken to the sentence. Those who desire to repeal that law, which forbids any account of man's origin to be taught in the public schools, at variance with the Bible account of creation, and the theory of evolution from lower forms to be substituted, must, it seems to us, bring the law itself into trial in the Supreme Federal Court. We fear that the dispute, in spite of poor Mr. Bryan's zeal, has done nothing to strengthen the anti-evolutionary case. His zeal was not in accord with knowledge: one feels that he would have accounted for fossils by saying they were created by God to mislead the atheist. Notwithstanding a false and ignorant assertion of Bishop Hensley Henson in the *Evening Standard* for July 28th—that "the Roman Catholic Church has answered with an emphatic negative" the question "can modern science be harmonized with historic Christianity," the only sound and rational attitude towards evolutionary theories is that adopted by the Church. She holds that God has revealed Himself both in Nature and in the Scriptures, and that, rightly understood, these two sources of knowledge bear the same testimony about Him. In her devotion to truth she condemns illogical inferences and false assumptions and every sort of unfounded prejudice. She admits all facts that are based on sound evidence, she has no quarrel with theories which are self-consistent and not at variance with already-established truth. She is much more "scientific" than many professed scientists, and, whilst making all allowance for the growth of knowledge, she gives no support to those of her children who in their teaching and speculation sin against true scientific method. Therefore her belief in the inspiration of God's word cannot be shaken by scientific discoveries, in making which indeed her members have been amongst the foremost, nor does she deny well-supported, scientific, truth—the case of Galileo only illustrates the fact—because it seems opposed to

revelation. She has never forbidden the teaching of evolution in her schools because, employing always Catholic teachers, she knows that no theory of human origins will be taught which contradicts either scientific or revealed truth.

**School  
"neutrality"  
impossible.**

The Dayton trial reveals a fundamental flaw in American public-school education which, in deference to the varied beliefs of the population, enforces so strict a religious "neutrality"

that in many States even simple Bible-reading is prohibited. Theoretically it seems reasonable that tax-supported schools should be non-sectarian, as many people might conscientiously object to paying for religious teaching which they considered false. But the flaw lies in the fact that such neutrality is impossible. God and the knowledge of God and of His relations with man are subjects so inextricably involved in any rational system of mind- and will-training that to leave them out is equivalently to deny them. We know what laicity means in France—that it is a mere cloak for positive irreligion,<sup>1</sup> put forward by Freemasonry. In America we may well believe there is no such anti-clericalism. But the effect is pretty nearly the same. Either education must be imperfect and superficial, or some account of the origin and destiny of the Universe must be attempted. Official "neutrality" forbids the teaching of the true account: therefore, a false account must be suggested if not actually taught. The inquisitive mind of youth will not be put off, and the questions asked must be answered truly or falsely. Those who in their anxiety to consult the requirements of every creed, forbid all teaching of religion, forget that God is knowable by reason as well as by revelation. There is such a science as Natural Theology, the most fundamental indeed of all, which is independent of all creeds drawn from revelation and as truly a part of scientific knowledge as the study of the earth and its contents. It would be absurd to say God's works may be studied but not God Himself. Neutrality as regards creeds cannot properly exclude this branch of study, and therefore systems of education which pretend to be wholly lay, so far from being fair to all, are fundamentally unfair. There is in practice no medium, as the Dayton case has shown, between teaching Theism and teaching atheism.

<sup>1</sup> As long ago as October 4th, 1904, M. Viviani wrote in *L'Humanité*—"Neutrality! It is, it always was a lie. Certainly it may have been a necessary lie when one had to frame the school-law in the midst of the raging wrath of the Right. . . . We promised this phantom of neutrality to reassure some timid members who might have combined to oppose the principle of the law."

**Catholic  
Celebrations of  
Nicæa.**

The Centenary of Nicæa was duly celebrated in Rome by a series of Conferences under the presidency of Cardinal Tacci, which began on May 28th and were concerned with the message which that great Council has for our time. But, unavoidably, the series of canonizations which was then in progress diverted public attention from these celebrations, an account of which will doubtless be published in *Orientalia Christiana*, the organ of the Pontifical Oriental Institute. An eloquent inaugural address by Père M. d'Herbigny has already appeared with the significant title, "Pour l'Unité Chrétienne: Croire en Jésus Christ."<sup>1</sup> The presence of many Uniate prelates and clergy was an object-lesson of that truth. If Christ is really believed in—His purpose, His knowledge, His power—there can be no barriers between those that so believe. Similar celebrations were held in Venice on June 24th, where East and West met again in harmony to express their common faith. In England Catholics have commemorated the great Council more indirectly, yet not ineffectively, by the Cambridge Summer School lately in session, during which a programme of papers by eminent scholars, native and foreign, on the appropriate subject of the Incarnation was discussed. Cambridge has been the scene of the several meetings of the "Modern Churchmen," that Anglican sect which practically denies the Godhead of our Lord, and therefore it is fitting that the place should be, so to speak, disinfected by this great exhibition of whole-hearted loyalty to God made man. We shall say more about it later.

**"Malines"  
a hindrance to  
conversion.**

Mention of these Anglican Modernists, an integral part of the comprehensive non-teaching "Establishment," leads us to deprecate once more that loose thinking, commoner amongst Catholics abroad than at home, which gives it the canonical status of a "Church." Since we wrote above on the subject of the Malines Conversations we have seen another report, this time dated from Rome, pointing definitely to their continuance, *sc.* "these regular reunions are now an institution." Let us say frankly that we hope the report is mistaken. The only good the Conferences can have done is to have enlightened Anglicans about the nature of the Church and to have shown them that Catholics can never regard them as belonging to a "Church" in any proper sense of the word. If this good result has not come about after four meetings, there is little likelihood of its being achieved in six or eight. Meanwhile their recurrence gives a plausible reason for Anglicans in doubt about their position (as

<sup>1</sup> *Orientalia Christiana*, August, 1925.



well they may be) to postpone the solution of those doubts until they see the upshot of "Malines," for they cannot but regard these frequent debates about an elementary point of faith as suggesting that the Catholic position is not as fixed and final as is pretended. It is natural that French and Belgian writers should be loath to recognize the failure of such a kind and Christian gesture as their countrymen have made, and should consider that some imaginary lack of sympathy, or even some less worthy disposition, influences the English Catholic view, but the facts, as we have frequently set them forth, does not justify their reluctance. So far from being a help, the Malines Conversations have now become a hindrance to the conversion of England.

THE EDITOR.

---

NOTE. Apropos of his article in our last issue—"Is Anglo-Catholicism near the Church?"—the Rev. H. E. G. Rope writes:

I find to my great regret and astonishment that certain expressions of mine have been construed into an attack on the Catholic loyalty of the late Mr. Wilfrid Ward, whose loyalty to the Church was undoubted, however much his judgment was (I venture to think) on occasion mistaken. In speaking of disloyalty, I had in mind, not Mr. Ward at all, but some of those imprudent folk who in the last five years have encouraged the renewed "Anglo-Catholic" efforts to have their "Church" recognized by Rome. Let me add that I am sure Mr. Ward's motive was the highest, that of charity, ill-advised, perhaps, in its direction, but thoroughly sincere and honourable. Although I still think that Cardinal Wiseman would have been surprised at the interpretation put upon his attitude, I gladly withdraw the hasty phrase "amazed and very indignant." I should have reflected that the late Mr. Ward was exceptionally cognizant of Cardinal Wiseman's views. I did not think I had laid myself open to the charge of attacking the memory of the dead. All I intended was a legitimate reference to what seems to me a regrettable error of judgment. To allude to Cardinal Newman's mistaken inopportunism would not be to call in question his loyalty.

Needless to say, the Editor of *THE MONTH* joins with Father Rope in regretting that there should even seem to have been a reflection on Mr. Ward's loyalty to the Church in his pages.

### III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest.]

#### CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

**Paul**, Position of St., in the Early Church [V. McNabb, O.P., in *Blackfriars*, July, 1925, p. 396].

**Sin** a Denial of Life's Purpose [E. R. Hull, S.J., in *Examiner* (Bombay), July 4, 1925, p. 321].

**Sunday** or Sabbath [R. R. Hull in *America*, July 4, 1925, p. 274].

**Union** with the Church, Conditions of [Mgr. Moyes in *Tablet*, July 18, 1925, p. 24].

#### CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

**Anglicans** and Nonconformists, Practice and Prospects of Union between [*Tablet*, August 1, 1925, p. 142].

**Anti-Catholic** Discrimination in Public Schools U.S.A. condemned by Law [R. R. Hull in *America*, June 27, 1925, p. 253].

**Batiffol** on Early Papal History, Mgr. [Dom J. Chapman in *Downside Review*, May, 1925, p. 39].

**Cox**, Mr. H., and Birth Control: Arguments refuted [H. Somerville in *Catholic Times*, July 11, 1925, p. 1].

**Modernism** and Mohammedanism: a parallel [A. L. Maycock in *Catholic Gazette*, August, 1925, p. 149].

**Orthodox** Church fraternizing with Anglicans [*Tablet*, July 4, 1925, p. 5; The Dissident East, J. Keating, S.J., in *Month*, August, 1925, p. 130].

**Psychical** Research and Religious Apologetics [Rev. P. E. Hallett in *Dublin Review*, July, 1925, p. 124].

#### POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

**Cambridge** Summer School [*Universe*, July 31, 1925, p. 6].

**Canada**. Success of State Control of Liquor Trade [*America*, July 18, 1925, p. 330].

**Marriage** in U.S.A. Protestants return to Catholic Doctrine [P. L. Blakely in *America*, July 18, 1925, p. 335].

**Miracles** and Medicine [G. H. Joyce, S.J., in *Catholic Medical Guardian*, July, 1925, p. 90].

**Mussolini** and the Masons [Stephen Grayson in *America*, July 11, 1925, p. 295].

**Persecution**, Changed Church Attitude towards [E. R. Hull, S.J., in *Examiner*, July, 11, 1925, p. 331].

**Saint Peter** in Rome: more evidence [H. Thurston, S.J., in *Month*, August, 1925, p. 119].

**Spain**. Success of Dictatorship [S. Grayson in *America*, July 18, 1925, p. 324].

# REVIEWS

## I—THE APOSTLES' CREED<sup>1</sup>

THE sub-title of this work describes it as "a vindication of the Apostolic Authorship of the Creed on the lines of Scripture and Tradition, together with some account of its Development and Critical Analysis of its Contents": indeed "the author believes he can justly claim that this book is the only one in any language" which undertakes such a vindication against the modern school of historical criticism (p. x.). We fear we cannot admit that the learned Bishop has proved his thesis: at most he is warranted in concluding that the Apostolic authorship of the Creed is not impossible. We cannot here enter into a discussion of the evidence: but reference must be made to some points of method. We fail to see how the problem is anything but a problem of historical criticism. Apart from revelation—and Dr. MacDonald presumably does not maintain that the Apostolic authorship of the Creed is a part of revealed doctrine—our only means of information lies in historical inquiry: yet he seems to state (p. 57 foll.) that he is using some other method. Again, his treatment of the "disciplina arcani" is confused: he explains (p. 32) the absence of the Creed in the works of St. Justin, and in the writers of the first three centuries, by the existence of such a "disciplina": but this supposes the very question at issue, viz., the existence of the Creed. We may note also that Origen's testimony (c. Cels. I. n. 7, et alibi) cannot be quoted in proof of the "disciplina": he is concerned with a very different matter—the question of two distinct classes within Christianity itself (pp. 10, 15).

Further, in his use of the evidence available, Dr. MacDonald is too ready to interpret his authorities as speaking of a formal creed, when it is possible that the reference is merely to the Gospel, or to the general body of Christian doctrine, the faith of Christians: indeed, he himself uses the same passage in Irenæus (adv. Haer. I. 10), on p. 234 to substantiate the assertion that "the Creed was one and the same," and on p. 284, to establish the existence of a *fides catholica*. He lays stress on the *τύπος διδασχῆς* of Rom. vi., which he considers must have been "the established Baptismal Confession of Faith of the Apostolic Church, in East and West, wherever the Gospel had been preached" (p. 181): but his reply (p. 196) to the ob-

<sup>1</sup> *The Apostles' Creed*. By the Rt. Rev. Alexander MacDonald, D.D. London: Kegan Paul. Pp. xvi. + 347. Price 10s. 6d.

jection that the expression "has been too lightly taken to be a formulated Confession of Faith," is weak in the extreme. When he proceeds (p. 182 foll.) to determine the content of this Creed, and to argue from "many considerations which lend the highest degree of antecedent probability to the correctness of the conclusions we have thus far reached" (p. 185), we can allow but little weight to his argument: to use a word he himself applies to Harnack (p. 178), we are inclined to call it "guesswork." The Appendices are useful. No. I. is the text and translation of a sermon of St. Augustine on the Creed: No. II. is an extract from Swete's "The Apostles' Creed," giving several forms of Western and Eastern Creeds.

The whole book lacks that quality of scholarship which the problem demands. We are not impressed by one who in a matter of this kind can bring himself to answer an opponent with "Let him tell that to the marines" (p. 285). Despite his hard words about the method of historical criticism which, we are told, "leads those who follow it . . . into a *cul-de-sac*" (p. 57), he is ready to use the work of Dr. Kunze who, by adhering to this method, has traced the Creed back to pre-Pauline times (p. 224). The same inconsistency is elsewhere apparent, (e.g., p. 173), where he admits that historical criticism discerns "in the New Testament 'an outline of teaching upon which Apostolic preachers and writers were agreed.' This is quite enough for our purpose." Dr. MacDonald must make up his mind: he cannot trust to a method which he is constantly decrying.

## 2—ST. THOMAS AQUINAS<sup>1</sup>

THE good the Cambridge Summer School does is not interred with its bones, but lives after it in the shape of a carefully-edited volume containing the papers read and discussed. Last year, when the Catholic world was celebrating the seventh centenary of the birth of St. Thomas, the subject naturally chosen for treatment was the philosophical and theological work wherewith he adorned his own day and which he left as a legacy to the Church for all time. The matter was divided into some nine categories, entrusted to as many learned professors, most of whom delivered two lectures. Bishop Janssens, O.S.B., Secretary to the Biblical Commission, who has himself compiled a *Summa* founded on St. Thomas and applied to current needs, began by discussing the character of the *Summa*

<sup>1</sup> *Papers from the Summer School of Catholic Studies held at Cambridge, August 4—9, 1924.* Edited by the Rev. C. Lattey, S.J. Cambridge: Heffer and Sons. Pp. xii. 311. Price 7s. 6d. net.

*Theologica* itself and the best method of studying it. Father P. P. Mackay, O.P., who is on the staff of the Leonine edition now on the eve of completion, treats, out of his abundant experience, of the form and style of that edition, surely the most sumptuous and elaborate ever devoted to the works of any theologian, and especially of the autograph of the *Summa contra Gentiles*, a large portion of which survives in the Saint's final draft. A close study of his autograph has enabled many corrections to be made in the text. To the competent hands of Dr. Richard Downey was entrusted the task of explaining the relations between St. Thomas and Aristotle, and the result has been one of the most interesting and important papers in the book. For Dr. Downey gives a brief and lucid survey of the whole history of philosophy, with the purpose of showing how it culminated in the Stagyrite, before demonstrating how a more highly-gifted mind even than that of the greatest of the pagans—gifted by grace as well as by nature—took his work, and strengthened, corrected and perfected it as the foundation of the matchless philosophy of the schools. No better estimate of the particular achievement of St. Thomas could be given in so brief a space. Dr. Aveling deals sympathetically with the natural science and psychology of St. Thomas who had at any rate a thoroughly scientific mind, hampered though he was by lack of experimental data and instruments of precision. In the Moral, Social and Political Sciences, as Dr. Michael Cronin of Dublin points out, he was much more at home, and his elucidation and application of Aristotle not only stands the test of modern criticism, but itself is beginning to win acceptance amongst non-Catholics. Father Sharpe, an authority on Mysticism, develops the ascetical doctrine of St. Thomas, not from any specific treatise, for there is none, but from the frequent incidental references to man's end and the means of attaining it. From the principles laid down in reference to the heresies and schisms of his time, Father Bede Jarrett, O.P., shows how emphatically St. Thomas insists on the visible Unity of the Church and the necessary Supremacy of the Pope as the only means by which Christendom can be re-united. The influence of St. Thomas on Dante by Professor Edward Bullough, and St. Thomas's own achievement in the form of liturgical poetry by the Bishop of Clifton, we can merely mention as the concluding papers of a very valuable collection, maintaining the high standard of the rest.

The Summer School is to be warmly congratulated on this volume, the fourth and not the least important of the series. It is equipped with various appendices relating to the Saint's life and works, and taken as a whole, forms an admirable introduction to the story of Catholic philosophy. As such it will

be found useful as a prize in the upper classes of our colleges: in fact, conjoined with the three previous volumes—the four priced at 23s.—it should figure permanently in the libraries of our students and even find its way into those of the public.

### 3—THE HOLY EUCHARIST<sup>1</sup>

WORKS concerning the Blessed Sacrament and Sacrifice continue to occupy the devout attention of Catholic writers and to pour from the Catholic press. That is as desirable as it is inevitable, as the subject is inexhaustible in its richness and variety, and the mystery far transcends the comprehension of the human mind. The five books under review approach their theme under different aspects and with different purposes. The Abbot of Buckfast in his previous books has shown how he can express the deepest ideas in clear and simple language. That is his purpose here, as he states himself, not to present a dogmatic treatise, not to penetrate into all the sublimities of his subject, not, immediately at least, to subserve devotion, but to make plain "to the meanest capacity" what the Holy Eucharist is and what it does. In one of his illuminating phrases, Mr. Chesterton says: "Our complex theology is only complex when we study it: it is simple when we see it. It can be seen as a whole and loved like a person." That seems to express Dom Anscar's aim, and he sets about it with characteristic thoroughness, doing a deal of preliminary hard thinking before he arrives at simple expression. He treats, first of all, of the Sacramental idea in itself before associating it with the Eucharist: then, keeping always that idea before him and using St. Thomas as standard and guide, he develops the whole theology of his subject. What the Abbot rightly considers "the Key" to the right understanding of the Catholic doctrine is that, as far as the sacramental and sacrificial formula is concerned, Christ is present under the species as a victim immolated for God's worship. Although we rightly worship Him as living and reigning in glory, and develop extra-liturgical devotions accordingly, Mass and Communion are necessarily associated with Calvary. Both worship and personal sanctification are accomplished by the same rite, by the offering

<sup>1</sup> *A Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist.* By Dom Anscar Vonier, O.S.B. London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne. Pp. xi. 269. Price 6s. *The Mass and the Church of England.* By "Veritas." Exeter: Catholic Records Press. Pp. 168. Price 2s. 6d. net. *The Real Presence of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist.* By Cardinal G. de Lai. Dublin: Browne & Nolan. Pp. x. 173. Price 4s. 6d. net. *The Mass.* By the Rev. J. A. Dunney. London: Sands & Co. Pp. viii. 375. Price 7s. 6d. net. *L'Eucharistie: Memento canonique et pratique.* By Canon P. Durieux. Paris: Gabalda. Pp. 328. Price 10.00 fr.



and consumption of the one Victim. The Abbot's treatise concerns more than the doctrine of the Eucharist. It is an exposition of the nature of the Sacramental system, it is also a valuable commentary on the teaching of St. Thomas, and it is a great stimulus to truer devotion springing from fuller understanding. But it needs some training in theology to follow its argument easily.

Father Dunney's book is a straightforward and exhaustive description of the actual ceremonies of the Mass, with a devotional commentary, illustrated by a great variety of apposite cuts, and carefully drawn up to serve as a liturgical text-book. How much more the Divine Sacrifice would be appreciated by children and adults as well if they could approach it with all the wealth of information contained in these pages. The book will be a godsend to all religious instructors.

Cardinal Gaetano de Lai's little treatise, which has been translated from the second Italian edition by a Christian brother, was apparently produced on occasion of the National Eucharistic Congress at Genoa last year. It is a simple exposition of the doctrine of the Real Presence following the usual lines—the O.T. tradition, the promise and the fulfilment in the N.T., the testimony of the early Fathers, and of the ancient monuments, and finally the evidence provided by miracles—and though it takes little account of the objections of unbelievers, it states clearly and convincingly the teaching of the Infallible Church.

As is evident from its title, *The Mass and the Church of England* is intended to expose the error amongst "Anglo-Catholics" that the Eucharistic service in their Book of Common Prayer is the Christian Mass. Little evidence is produced which has not been frequently used before, but "Veritas" has marshalled the facts in a very striking way, and shows by what is known as "the method of the deadly parallel," how deliberately and how effectively the English Reformers laboured to expunge from their ordinal and their service-book all traces of the old Catholic doctrine which they considered false and blasphemous. There is no answer to these cold facts.

Finally, Canon P. Durieux's important volume approaches the Eucharist from the point of view of Church law, and after stating its nature, both as a Sacrifice and a Sacrament, develops under each head the corresponding canonical legislation. It is a boon to have this necessary information presented so accurately and fully.

## SHORT NOTICES.

### MORAL THEOLOGY.

A NOTICE of the first volume of Canon de Smet's scholarly work—**Betrothment and Marriage** (Herder: 20s. the two volumes)—appeared in these pages in April, 1914. This second volume (2nd Edit.) deals with matrimonial impediments and dispensations, a matter of very great moment for all priests on the mission. The notes on the historical development of the Church's discipline and the references to civil legislation are particularly interesting. The section (pp. 218 sqq.) on the powers of parish priests and confessors in dispensing from impediments will be extremely helpful and enlightening, and English-speaking priests owe a considerable debt to the author, and to the translator, Father A. Owens, S.J.

### APOLOGETIC.

Father Frank Woodlock's little book, **Modernism and the Christian Church** (Longmans: 2s. 6d. and 3s. 6d.), which is introduced in characteristic style by Mr. Chesterton, brings together an immense amount of information regarding the steady growth of Arianism in western communities separated from the Catholic Church. The solvent of private judgment is breaking up the ancient creeds. Men, refusing the submission of the intellect to revealed mystery which is the first condition of service exacted by the Infinite God, are fashioning gods of their own and making their puny intellects the measure of truth. After showing in three incisive chapters the havoc wrought by Modernism on the Creeds, the Divinity of Christ and Christian evidences, the author discusses in the light of those alarming facts the immense obstacle created by this thorough rejection of the supernatural in the way of the reunion of Christendom. It is a book to make all sincere Anglicans ask—Can I safely stay where I am?

### DEVOTIONAL.

The "full-dress" biography of the Venerable Mary Aikenhead, Foundress of the Irish Sisters of Charity, lately published, has yet left room for a little book called **The Teaching of Mary Aikenhead** (Longmans: 2s. net), which embodies the spiritual direction given by the Foundress to various members of her Congregation during the long years in which she ruled it from her sick-room. These counsels, classified under the main Christian virtues, are a model of wise spiritual insight and have, of course, a universal bearing.

Although cast in a narrative form, Dr. H. J. Heuser's **Autobiography of an Old Breviary** (Benziger Bros.: \$1.75) is a treatise on that venerable common-prayer book of the Catholic Church, in which the matter is treated, both historically and actually, with not a little humour. Its perusal is calculated to revive in the clergy an appreciation of the *onus diei* and to give those preparing for the priesthood a lofty idea of the privilege awaiting them.

### BIOGRAPHICAL.

We are glad that Mr. Stanley B. James has collected into book-form those fascinating chapters of his spiritual romance which he contributed last year to the *Catholic World*. For the narrative of his life and con-

version, which he calls *The Adventures of a Spiritual Tramp* (Longmans: 5s. net), has great "apologetic" value. The religious experiences he went through are not of course unique: the impossibility of finding final rest for mind and heart, save in the one Church wherein Christ dwells to the end of time, is the motive of all such pilgrimages, but in this instance the pilgrim, or tramp as Mr. James calls himself, is dowered with powers of reflection and literary skill beyond the common, and the result is a tale of singular vigour and conviction. Those who have marked the author's now frequent contributions to the Catholic press will not need to be assured that they will meet in this autobiography a sound appreciation of the unique character of Catholicity, as combining in itself whatever is true and valuable in the sects and as providing for the intellect that solid basis of truth without which fruitful speculation is impossible, all conveyed with plentiful grace and humour. Father Knox's witty, apt, profound preface emphasizes the lesson of the narrative and cleverly spikes the guns of hostile critics.

The interest which the recent canonization of the foundress of the Society of the Sacred Heart has awakened or stimulated will find full gratification in the biography of *Saint Madeleine Sophie* (Longmans: 2s. 6d.), which Mother Maud Monahan has lately published. The Saint was one of the great pioneers of Christian education for girls in the early part of last century. How she was fashioned for the work and what success attended her may be read in these thoughtful pages. When she died in 1865 her Society numbered 89 convents in the Old World and the New. Since then it has spread to the Antipodes, and, in spite of the "raging of the Gentiles," the number of houses has risen to 152.

The same publishers issue a pamphlet at 3d., *St. Madeleine-Sophie*, which gives a sketch of her spiritual life.

#### HISTORICAL

Father Marius Barbera, S.J., in *Merrigio d'Ethiopia* (Rome, 1924) has given a sketch of Jesuit missionary life in Abyssinia during the seventeenth century; a period marked by great vicissitudes: which saw the momentary triumph of the Catholic religion by the solemn abjuration in 1624 of the Eutychian heresy after nine centuries of domination—a triumph which was succeeded almost immediately by reaction and a régime of violent persecution. This is the historical background of Father Barbera's narrative, which is based on the vast collection, "*Rerum Aethiopicarum scriptores occidentales inediti a saec. XVI. and XIX.*," recently edited by Father Camillas Beccari, S.J.

The history of the Huguenots forms a chapter of French history which has much more than a merely national importance. The Abbé Dédien, who is an expert in this field, shows clearly in his *Histoire Politique des Protestants français 1715—1794* (Gabalda, 25 fr.) how considerable, and in many cases how direct, was the influence of the Huguenot pastors and their congregations in bringing about the downfall of the monarchy. The fluctuations of Government policy towards the heretics during the period are well described. Toleration and repression were tried alternately, but without effect. The French Government certainly displayed but little political intelligence in dealing with the problem. Their system of intolerance appears to have lacked both continuity and thoroughness. In the gentle art of persecution they had much to learn from neighbouring

nations, whether beyond the Pyrenees or across the Channel. Rarely has a Government incurred so much odium to so little purpose. But it must in fairness be remembered that the Huguenots were dangerous antagonists, exceptionally able and often exceptionally unscrupulous. Even under the ablest direction, the old Catholic monarchy could hardly have survived in its traditional form against the combined forces of irreligion and heresy.

**A Short History of Medieval England**, by A. Gordon Smith, M.A. (Burns, Oates and Washbourne: 6s.) is a masterly summary of the history of England from the treaty of Wedmore in 878 to the death of Richard III. at Bosworth in 1485. The events and characters of historical importance are well presented, and their influence on after years plainly indicated. This book, easy to hold and pleasant to read, is excellent for a beginner; but it will also please the advanced student who wishes to revive memories which time has dimmed or to re-focus a special period already done in greater detail. The last chapter, which deals with England at the close of the Middle Ages, rightly points out that scandalous tales told about priests and religious were real scandals just because they were exceptions and not the rule. One black sheep catches the eye while fifty white ones pass unnoticed. At the end are several useful appendices, of which the last gives most of the authorities consulted. A full index completes a meritorious volume. In the footnote on pp. 242-3 Scotus is described as an extreme realist; he was too subtle to be extreme.

Most people have heard of the famous Mount Melleray, the abode of the Trappists in County Waterford. Not so well known is Mount St. Joseph, a more recent foundation at Roscrea in Tipperary. But those who purchase **An Epitome of Cistercian History: from Cîteaux to Roscrea** (The Monastery or from The Talbot Press, Dublin: 2s. net), a beautifully produced and illustrated book, will find their ignorance dissipated in a most delightful and interesting way. The whole glorious history of St. Bernard's foundation is sketched with masterly strokes—its origin, its spread, its vicissitudes, its decline, its wonderful and lasting revival. At the same time a clear idea is conveyed of the true Cistercian *ethos*, a spirit which results not only in the highest forms of spiritual culture but overflows, as it were, to bless the material earth on which it lives. The pictures are all good, but particular praise must be given to the representation of the General Chapter at Cîteaux in 1920, which aptly illustrates how well holy-living, health and happiness can be combined.

#### ANGLICAN.

If ever there are moments when we feel vastly enamoured of syllogisms and strict syllogistic disputation, it is after reading such a collection of essays as is provided by the Rev. F. J. Badcock, D.D., in **Reviews and Studies, Biblical and Doctrinal** (Longmans: 7s. 6d. net), wherein the writer seems to start from nowhere in particular, and end up without being perceptibly nearer to any given point. "It is hoped," we are told, "that the reader will find that, in spite of the diversity of matter, there is a unity of view-point and harmony of treatment which make the collection an organized whole." But in any case the thought and language are not clear enough for an organized whole. How far is the Trinity explained, or explained away? And Christ's two Natures?

We are told that "we owe to the Modernists a large debt of gratitude" (p. 23), that Christ "did not claim to be God the Son" (110); these and other such remarks do not allow us to credit the writer with any large margin of belief. Some of the New Testament papers, exegetical rather than primarily dogmatical, do not fit well into the "organized whole," but contain some useful points. However, even here we are told that we must understand the Petrine text (Matt. xvi. 18-19) of Christ Himself: in Christ's words we need only to supply a preliminary, "*Thus saith the Lord to me, Thou art the Rock,*" etc. What more simple? And coming at the end of a few centuries of discussion, the originality of the suggestion merits a smile.

## FICTION.

The wiles of a money-lender form the foil to a well-constructed story of fair women and brave men set in the neighbourhood of St. Louis, and called **The Valley of Peace** (Herder: 6s. net). The writer, Lida L. Coghlan, has a pleasing style and the introduction of a negro "Aunt" gives the authentic Southern flavour. A wholesome and interesting story.

Mr. P. J. O'Connor Duffy is one of the modern Irish story-tellers who weave into picturesque Anglo-Irish idiom the pretty or playful fancies of their minds or, it may be, actual legends lingering amongst the peasantry of the land. Such a collection has he gathered together in **The Riches of the Poor Man** (B.O. and W.: 5s.)—stories of pathos or humour, vivid with the imagery of Nature and alive with the life of men. A book out of the common, wholly innocent, we are glad to note, of that debased paganism which some recent Irish writers affect.

The same gifted writer in **Strings for a Harp** (B.O. and W.: 2s. 6d.) mingles ancient and modern themes, never disguising the underlying moral, but showing a keen sense of the humours and sorrows of human life, and the beauties of nature.

Miss A. H. Bennett has written in **The Return of the Ortons** (Sands: 6s. net) a striking tale of penal times with an epilogue giving the history of the family concerned up-to-date. In spite of a rather lavish use of the preternatural the story keeps one interested. In exacting a confession from a convert who is going to be baptized for the first time, the writer goes beyond the requirements of the Church.

Some of the very readable stories in **The Master's Vineyard** (Sands: 3s. 6d. net), by the Rev. J. P. Redmond have already appeared in our pages, but we are glad to see them again in a more permanent form, together with others of the same wholesome class—an embodiment of the experiences of one who knows human nature all through, but always remembers its spiritual side and has the knack of showing its abiding importance.

The one drawback to a witty and well-constructed novel by E. C. Reed—**The Mirror** (J. Long: 7s. 6d. net)—is the author's ready turning to the unholy device of divorce to get his heroine out of a matrimonial tangle with a reference to the old immoral rubbish about "affinity of souls" being "the only justification of marriage." There are several delightful characters in the story, humorously and consistently drawn.

When Mrs. Francis Blundell ("M. E. Francis") sets out to write a tale she has always one to tell, and that it will be charmingly written is of course a foregone conclusion. **Golden Sally** (Sands and Co.: 6s. net) is no exception to the rule, and when a delightful girl leaves her convent

school in England to go to Canada to an invalid father and vulgar step-mother—giving up at the same time all the advantages life with a rich aunt in England would have given her—one feels there are storms ahead. Nor is one disappointed, but these clouds have a silver lining and all ends happily as we felt it would. A pretty, if unsophisticated little tale, refreshing to find among the fiction of to-day, as refreshing as the violet or primrose among a lot of hot-house flowers—and weeds.

#### MISCELLANEOUS.

A new and poignant interest is given to the familiar streets of the metropolis north of the Thames by the publication of Canon Edwin Burton's *London Streets and Catholic Memories* (B.O. & W.: 5s.), wherein the author's unrivalled knowledge of "persecution times" is drawn on to point out the historic and religious significance of our changing thoroughfares. The comparatively narrow compass of the Canon's pilgrimage—Oxford Street and its prolongation eastward and the Strand—reminds us of the smallness of the London of those days. And his intensely interesting narrative recalls the greatness of heart of those confessors and martyrs to whom we owe the preservation of the Faith.

Miss Stenson in *A Pilgrim's Miscellanea* (Heath Cranton: 5s. net) goes further afield and discourses on celebrated shrines of Spain, Bohemia and Italy, but especially of Rome, in a manner that combines instruction with edification. Those who are privileged to visit places such as these, associated with great saints and famous shrines, will find her volume an invaluable companion. And it may well whet the appetite and stir the devotion of those compelled to stay at home.

In a volume of essays called *The Two Cities or Statecraft and Idealism* (Longmans: 4s. 6d. net) Miss Petre embodies various reflections on questions aroused or accentuated by the world-war. Much that she says concerning the material aims and the defective machinery of the modern State is shrewd and helpful. She sees that no exterior or mechanical readjustment can avail unless it be the outcome of a moral change: that undue national selfishness will always produce international discord. But the author repeats in an essay called "Krieg ist Krieg" her strange contention that war "is a definite repudiation of a common good, and in fact, of a common God," although elsewhere she allows that war may be just. This contradiction leads her to regard it as necessitating a sort of suspension of the moral law, whereas, of course, justice is the end professedly sought for by both sides in every war, and the God of Justice, the common Father of all, is invoked to secure it. Much of Miss Petre's argument would be simplified if she recognized that the sole international question to be solved now is whether the world-States retain enough Christianity to recognize and act upon the Christian truism that "honesty is the best policy."

A series of conversations about various points of Catholic interest, made more or less continuous by being centred round the personality of a learned and genial Convent Chaplain, appears in Father H. J. Heuser's new book *The Chaplain of St. Catherine's* (Longmans: 9s. net). Not all the subjects are religious, for the Chaplain is well-read and artistic, and has a cultivated taste in tobacco and wine, but all are dealt with in the spirit of one who keeps things material and mundane in their proper place. In his capacity as Chaplain, the writer has to expound



Catholic doctrine occasionally, so that not a little "apologetic" is contained within his covers.

All forest lovers—indeed all lovers of nature—will find in F. E. Steven's book, *The New Forest Beautiful* (Methuen: 8s. 6d. net), a feast of delight. Not only is the forest graphically and artistically described, but the historical features are given their due importance and make most interesting reading. There are some beautiful photographic studies—always the better way we think of illustrating books on places—and although the front page tersely informs us it is a book "with 20 illustrations and a map," the map (by Laurence Irving) is such a sheer delight that we should not call it the least part by any means of a most charming book.

#### MINOR PUBLICATIONS.

*The Catholic Mind* continues with unfailing regularity to furnish fortnightly useful excerpts from current contributions to the Catholic press which might otherwise be lost sight of. The issues, Nos. 9—13 of Vol. XXIII. (May 8th—July 8th), now before us (America Press: 5 c. each), contain several articles on devotion to Our Lady, a discourse on the Carmelite ideal, the Doctrine of the Eucharist, an account of the recently beatified Jesuit martyrs, an address on the Christian ideal of the family, and another on the duties of Society towards the criminal.

The Catholic Truth Society have lately issued three new twopenny pamphlets—*Out of the Depths*, a Story by the Rev. J. F. Lane, *Prayers for the Conversion of England*, originally composed in Latin by Cardinal Wiseman, translated by Father Ignatius Spencer, and now edited by the Rev. Dr. Bird, and *The Catholic Evidence Guild*, by Mr. F. J. Sheed, once its Master here at Westminster and now occupying the same post in Australia. The Society has also reprinted Father Lester's witty and cogent *Dialogues of Defence*, Nos. I. and II., Father Pritchard's *How to Follow the Mass* (for non-Catholics), 46th thousand! and a new and revised edition of the *Simple Prayer Book*, of which there have now been printed 2,725,000 copies!

Mr. W. H. Atherton, who has had so much to do with the inauguration and maintenance of the well-known and highly-useful Catholic Sailors' Club of Montreal, has appropriately written a *History* of the institution from its beginning in 1893 to the end of last year. It will be valuable, not only as a souvenir, but also as a stimulus to others to do likewise. For the need is great and universal.

#### BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

BURNS, OATES & WASHBOURNE, London.

*Old Catholic Lancashire.* By Dom F. O. Blundell, O.S.B. Vol. I. Pp. xiv. 192. Price, 5s. *Certain Godly and Devout Prayers.* Edited by Dom R. Hudleston. Pp. xvi. 50. Price, 2s. 6d. *Our First Communion.* By Rev. W. R. Kelly. Pp. 64. Price, 1s. *John Ogilvie.* By W. E. Brown. Pp. viii. 310. Price, 7s. 6d.

CATHOLIC HOSPITALS ASSOCIATION, Milwaukee.

*The Patients' Book.* By E. Gar-  
esché, S.J. Pp. viii. 151.

CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, London.

*Several Twopenny Pamphlets.*

HERDER, London.

*Betrothment and Marriage.* By  
Canon de Smet. Vol. II. Pp.  
viii. 375. Price, 2 vols., 20s. *Five*

- Minutes Sermons.* By J. Elliot Ross, C.P. Pp. x. 314. Price, 7s. *Liturgical Prayer Book.* Edited by Dom F. Cabrol. Pp. xxviii. 940. Price from 5s.
- HERDER, Freiburg.  
*Caritaswissenschaft.* By Dr. F. Keller. Pp. viii. 252. Price, 3.60 m. *Handbuch zur Biblischen Geschichte.* I. Das Alte Testament. By Dr. J. Schuster and Dr. J. B. Holhammer. Pp. xx. 874. Price, 22.00 m.
- JOHN LONG, London.  
*The Mirror.* By E. C. Reed. Pp. 318. Price, 7s. 6d. n.
- LA BONNE PRESSE, Paris.  
*Une Enquête sur les Réformes Urgentes.* By H. Reverdy. Pp. 172. Price, 3.00 fr. *Ni l'un ni l'autre.* Translated from Benson's "Come Rack, Come Rope." By Emmanuel. Pp. 246. Price, 2.00 fr. *Saint-Sébastien hors des Murs.* By H. Chéramy, P.S.S. Pp. 87. Illustrated.
- LETHIELLEUX, Paris.  
*Dévotions et Pratiques Ascétiques du Moyen Age.* By Dom L. Gongaude. Pp. viii. 240. Price, 7.00 fr.
- LIBRAIRIE ISTRA, Strasbourg.  
*Le Culte.* By R. Will. Vol. I. Pp. xiii. 458. Price, 60.00 fr.
- MARIETTI, Turin.  
*Sti Thomæ in Aristotelis Librum De Anima Commentarium.* Edited by F. A. M. Pirotta, O.P. Pp. 308. *Le Jubilé hors de Rome.* By P. J. Lacau, S.J. Pp. 30. Price, 1.00 fr.
- MOUNT ST. JOSEPH ABBEY, Roscrea.  
*An Epitome of Cistercian History.* By a Cistercian. Illustrated. Pp. 72. Price, 2s. 3d. post free.
- PUSTET, New York.  
*The End of the World and of Man.* By D. I. Lanslots, O.S.B. Pp. 178. Price, \$1.50.
- PUSTET, Munich.  
*Die Sacramentalenlehre des Richard von Mediavilla.* By Dr. Josef Lechner. Pp. viii. 426. Price, RM 8.
- SANDS & Co., London.  
*Tom Smith's Conversion.* By O. R. Vassall-Phillips, C.S.S.R. Pp. 82. Price, 1s. n. *All the Year Round.* By Sister M. Emmanuel, O.S.B. Illustrated. Pp. 70. Price, 1s. 6d. n. *Prayer for all Times.* By Pierre Charles, S.J. Pp. 179. Price, 5s.
- S.P.C.K., London.  
*The Council of Nicaea.* By Rev. A. E. Burn, D.D. Pp. xi. 143. Price, 3s. 6d. n. *The Mirror of the Months.* By Sheila Kaye-Smith. Pp. 70. Price, 6s. *Sacramentals.* By Marcus Donovan. Pp. x. 192. Price, 6s.
- TEQUI, Paris.  
*Saint Vincent de Paul.* By Abbé A. d'Agnel. Pp. xii. 386. Price, 10.00 fr. *Prêtre? Pourquoi pas?* By Abbé C. Grimaud. Pp. 134. Price, 3.60 fr. *Saint Thomas.* By Abbé L. Lavaud. Pp. viii. 277. Price, 7.50 fr. *La Sainte Eucharistie.* By J. Gerber, S.J. Pp. 200. Price, 5.00 fr. *Le Catechisme vécu à Lourdes.* By Canon Duplessy and Dr. Marchand. Pp. viii. 261. Price, 7.00 fr. *Sainte Thérèse de l'Enfant Jésus.* By Abbé P. Giloteaux. 5th edit. Pp. xxi. 212. Price, 7.00 fr. *Les Elites Sociales et le Sacerdoce.* By H. le Floch, S.Sp. Pp. 42. Price, 1.50 fr. *Manete in Dilectione mea.* Pp. 48. Several other pamphlets.
- UNIVERSITY PRESS, Oxford.  
*The Little Flowers of St. Francis.* Rendered into English verse by James Rhoades. Pp. xvi. 320. Price, 2s. and 3s. 6d. n.
- "VITA E PENSIERO," Milan.  
*La Lega Italica: 1454-1455.* Pp. 213. *Il Rivoltatore.* By P. M. Cordovani, O.P. Pp. 483. Price, 20.00 lire. *Six other smaller publications.* S. Elisabetta d'Ungheria. By Emilio Horn. Pp. 310. Price, 8.00 lire. *La Filosofia di Benedetto Croce.* By Emilio Chiocchetti. 3rd edit. Pp. 334. Price, 15.00 lire. *Il Pensiero de S. Bernardino da Siena.* By Maria Sticco. Pp. 200. Price, 8.00 lire. *Il Regno del SS. Cuore di Gesù.* By Mgr. G. Sinibaldi. Pp. 568. Price,
- UNIVERSITE DE LOUVAIN.  
*L'Influence Musicale de l'Abbaye de Saint-Gall.* By Dom R. Van Doren, O.S.B. Pp. 158.

f.  
3.  
1.  
re  
s.

A.  
e,  
e  
1.  
s.  
2.

A.  
e,  
?  
4.  
y  
7.  
r-  
o.  
ie  
1-  
o.  
e  
y  
o.  
s  
y  
e,  
s.  
.

s.  
y  
o.

o.  
l.  
e,  
o.  
r-  
o.  
ll  
o  
l.  
e  
y  
e,  
s.  
1-

e  
n